

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA  
ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF INDIA  
CENTRAL  
ARCHAEOLOGICAL  
LIBRARY

ACCESSION NO. 20100

CALL No. 724.09/Fer


D.G.A. 79.

VOL: I

~~B150~~














HISTORY  
OF  
MODERN ARCHITECTURE.

VOL. I.




ST. PETER'S, ROME.



(67)

(HISTORY

OF THE



# MODERN STYLES OF ARCHITECTURE:)

By JAMES FERGUSON, D.C.L. F.R.S., &c.

Vol. 1.



Opera, Paris.

THIRD EDITION, REVISED.

SECOND IMPRESSION.

20100

By ROBERT KERR, ARCHITECT, F.R.I.B.A.;

FELLOW AND HONORARY PROFESSOR OF KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON; AUTHOR OF "THE GENTLEMAN'S HOUSE," "THE CONSULTING ARCHITECT," &c.

IN TWO VOLUMES—VOL. I.

WITH ILLUSTRATIONS.

LONDON:

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.

1902.

724.09  
For



CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL  
LIBRARY, NEW DELHI.

Acc. No. 20100

Date 28. 2. 55

Call No. 724.09/Fer.



## PREFACE TO THE THIRD EDITION (1891).

BY THE EDITOR.

Let us fix our attention upon the memorable year 1851.

It has been the fashion in this generation, with certain eager and almost too well meaning people of the more æsthetic order, to speak of "the nineteenth century" with scorn and derision. In all its thoughts, words, and works, they affirm it to be inartistic and vulgar, and this more especially—sad to say—in England. Nothing that animates it being good, everything that it produces goes inevitably to the bad. Nor do these melancholy if estimable enthusiasts entertain any great hopes, on ordinary ground, of the approaching future. It is still unpromising; and their simple advice is that we should call back to life other and better days. Accordingly, certain periods of the past have been quoted for "revival" by this and that section of the malcontents, sometimes with fervour, always with confidence. Imitation of course has followed freely; and in literature, in music, in painting and sculpture, and most of all in architecture and its allied arts, the efforts that have been made to cover this nakedness and deformity of our era with the cast-off garniture of bygone time have been so vigorous, so earnest, and so sincere, as not merely to deserve passing respect, but to command the more enduring credit that is due to unquestionable success; so that on the whole the achievement of reform has doubtless gone far to justify the act of revolt.

We need not, however, trouble ourselves for the moment with a consideration of these matters. We may admit that the nineteenth century has many sins to answer for, perhaps too many. But let us look at the historical year 1851. Not only does it divide incidentally one half of this nineteenth century from the other, but it happens to separate a quite old-fashioned half-century from one of an entirely new character—the old half the fag-end of a listless past, the new half the commencement of a reanimated future. The Victorian Age of English Art, as a period in which history will unquestionably recognise very remarkable qualities, begins with the International Exhibition of 1851.

No one whose eyes are open to the question will be disposed to deny



that since that date the artistic sense in England has been steadily developing itself in all directions on new lines ; and it may be safely asserted that a corresponding evolution of a new feeling for Art has been taking place all over the civilised world. There are those, of course, who sneer at our Great Exhibitions, their puffs, and their prizes ; but this is idle. More thoughtful people, and more practical, prefer to regard the celebrated concourse of 1851 as the successful commencement of a long and still continuing series of *International Industrial Convocations*, organised with enthusiasm in all the chief cities of the world in quick succession, with this magnanimous purpose—the universal expansion and improvement of the Arts of Industry, of every order equally, and alike in every land. Surely it is scarcely too much to say that no other enterprise of such practical and palpable beneficence has ever been attempted in the long history of mankind. Far from seeing the end of it yet, we are but at the beginning of its invaluable results ; and one of the principal of these results is to be discerned in a very striking movement, more or less conspicuous everywhere, for *the popularising of Art*. On every hand there is, in one form or another, a loosening of bonds. Restraints of worn-out traditions are being cast off. Local mannerisms are being lost. Pseudo-patriotic exclusiveness and educational prejudice are disappearing under the genial influence of world-wide intimacy and co-operation. The genius of the human race at large, as one great industrial and artistic family, is everywhere taking up liberal popular ground. And amongst the rest, the long-renowned *Industrial Art of Architecture*, Queen of the Industrial Arts, has not overlooked her mission.

In this view of the case, the most promising course to adopt in any attempt to trace the progress of Architecture throughout the world in the Victorian Era would be to note its condition in each of the great communities at the year 1851, and from thence to follow its local progress, with express reference to *Industrial Art at large*, comprehensively, popularly, and non-academically. As regards England the consequence of such a study must be this. We soon leave behind us the constrained and pedantic "Fine Art of Architecture" of the academical books, applying itself to certain accepted kinds of dogmatically glorified building and to nothing else. We find ourselves in a far wider sphere of influence. The very formula of Royal Academies—the Renaissance formula of "Painting, Sculpture, and Architecture"—changes its significance. Architecture, more especially, steps down from her academic pedestal, and welcomes to her embrace a whole family of non-academicals. "Minor Arts" is what they have been called hitherto, supplementary arts, subsidiary arts, and so on, mere ornamental and decorative arts, inferior arts, commonplace industries. *Architectural Art* now embraces them all, no longer of unequal dignity with herself, but of altogether equal and similar comeliness of grace. Bone of her bone, indeed, and flesh of her flesh, they group themselves, as they have



always done, around the ancestral central Art of Building, but they are constituents now and colleagues, not poor retainers and subordinates. We have only to think for a moment of the generous philosophy of this unity, and what must follow is precisely what we see. The English architect of to-day has for his fellows and fellow-workers, no longer the dainty dilettante only, or the pious ecclesiologist, but all those popular handlers of the pencil—the same pencil as his own—the decorator, the colourist, the ornamentalist, the glass-painter, the modeller, the carver, the statuary, the metal-worker, the furnisher, the tissue-worker, the clay-worker, the plaster-worker, in short, the whole order of those designers who produce *Art Architectural*, amongst whom he is sufficiently proud to be, as his name implies *Architectus* only, technical chief.

Looking at the backward condition of artistic taste in England prior to the epoch of 1851, and the prominent position which the country has since assumed in the march of industrial progress in general, it is only natural that the change of principle and practice thus accounted for should manifest itself more distinctly here than elsewhere. But at the same time we have now to class with England on this interesting ground on more equal terms than formerly, not only the sister kingdoms of Scotland and Ireland, but the whole of the Anglo-Saxon Empire. Canada, Australia, New Zealand, the Cape, India, have all felt the same glad influence in different degrees and forms; and—what may seem at first sight strange—the exceedingly independent United States of America, without a moment's compromise of their self-confidence, have preferred to follow the course of English progress with a fidelity of kindred and indeed filial feeling that is most interesting and flattering to contemplate.

On the Continent of Europe we should scarcely expect to be able to discern the same development of free and popular Art; for the business of design has hitherto been always more free and popular there than in England. But nevertheless it is clearly to be seen that in France, in Belgium and Holland, in Germany and Austria, in Italy, and even in Russia, the invariable, because inevitable, consequence of international competition and rivalry has been to liberate and popularise all Industrial Art whatever, and, amongst the rest, to release practical Architecture more or less from a feeling of academical restraint. Everywhere, in a word, during the last forty years, the thoughts of architects have been widening with the progress of the world.\*

The historical additions now made to our author's work will be found to turn upon the general idea thus indicated. There is appended to the various sections which deal with the several nationalities such further historical matter as appears in each case to be necessary under the heading of "Recent Architecture;" and it is hoped that the appropriation chiefly to England and America of the additional space at command will be approved by the reader, on account of the peculiar interest which will be found to attach to the progress of the Art in the Anglo-Saxon portions

of the world. But as regards the original text of the work it has been thought best to make no alteration whatever ; and the Editor has therefore confined himself to the task of introducing occasional comments, with the object, not of correcting the author, but of accommodating his bold and forcible opinions to the modified thinking of the present day, and perhaps to the practical experience of the working architect. Fergusson's text is therefore left absolutely as he left it, and the intention is that the added observations shall be accepted and considered by the reader always as explanations most respectfully offered to carry forward the views of a critic who, although far in advance of his time, has necessarily been overtaken by the rapid progress of subsequent events.

The Editor has to record his cordial acknowledgments to the professional journals, as well as to private architects and to the Council of the Institute, for the additional illustrations which are introduced.

It has to be noted that in every case the *Editorial Additions* are printed in the same type as the text, but distinguished by the use of *brackets*, thus [ ]. So also in the *Index* and the *List of Illustrations* (although not in the Table of Contents) the new matter is distinguished by the use of *italics*.

The additional engravings have been produced, with his usual care and intelligence, by Mr. Cooper, by whom the whole of the original illustrations were supplied. In respect of the choice of subjects, the Editor's very difficult task has been to select from the overwhelming mass of admirable examples, not an adequate, but a manageable number, which should serve the simple purpose of indicating the lines of progress.

Thanks are especially due to the accomplished writer for the Memoir of the Author which forms part of the prefatory matter, and none the less for his interesting postscript ; also to the Council of the Royal Asiatic Society from whose Transactions the Memoir is taken.

ROBERT KERR.

London, January, 1891.





## THE AUTHOR'S PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION (1862).

---

WHEN the 'History of Architecture' was first published in two volumes, in 1855, it was intended that it should have been followed by a third, completing the history of the art from the earliest day to the present time. Various engagements and occupations have hitherto prevented this intention from being carried into effect, and the concluding portion of the work is in consequence now given to the public in such a form that it may either be bound up as the third volume of the 'Handbook,' or treated as an entirely separate work complete in itself.

Even independently of the lapse of time which has occurred since the first publication, the nature of the subject demands a different class of treatment from that pursued in the earlier portions of the History. For reasons explained in the Introduction to this volume, it is no longer possible to treat it as the consecutive history of an important art, carried out in every part of the globe on the same well-understood and universally acknowledged principles. Extraneous matters and individual tastes and caprices have been imported into the practice of the art to such an extent, that it is at every page necessary to stop to explain and guard against them; and this volume in consequence becomes far more a critical essay on the history of the aberrations of the art during the last four centuries than a narrative of an inevitable sequence of events, as was the case in the previous parts of the work.

Notwithstanding this, the mode of treatment is the same as nearly as was practicable with such different materials, in order that the whole might form one work; so that, except the essential distinction between the principles on which the ancient and modern styles are carried out, there is little change beyond a slight variation in the nature of the illustrations. These are generally of a much more pictorial character than those of the former volumes, the object being to reproduce the stone picture as conceived in the mind of an individual artist, not to trace the gradual development of a quasi-natural



art. In consequence of this, there are fewer plans than in the 'Hand-book,' and a smaller number of purely architectural illustrations.

Where plans of churches and other similar buildings are introduced which admit of comparison with those engraved for the previous volumes, they are all reduced to the same scale of 100 feet to 1 inch, but this has been impossible with palaces and many civil edifices, their extent being such as to require a space of three or four times the size of a page of this volume for their display; and the dimensions even of many of the churches are such that it has been found impracticable, from the same cause, to adhere to the scale of 50 feet to 1 inch for elevations and sections, as was the case in the previous volumes. This is of infinitely less importance here than it would have been when speaking of the true styles, inasmuch as the plans of Renaissance churches are seldom interesting as developments of any system, and those of civil buildings are rarely of any value beyond showing the general dimensions of the edifice, while in palaces and dwelling-houses, unless the plans of two or three storeys are given, the whole is unintelligible. Even when this is done, their complicated and utilitarian arrangement can never compete in interest with the great internal halls of temples or churches, which are often quite as artistic and as monumental as the exterior of the buildings which contain them.

It need, perhaps, hardly be mentioned that the present work by no means pretends to be a complete history of the Renaissance styles. So numerous are the examples, that it would require three or four volumes to describe them all, and more than a corresponding increase in illustrations to render them intelligible. All that has been attempted has been to select the best and most typical specimens in each country, and these only; and by means of them to point out the peculiarities and to explain the aims of each separate nationality; while, as a general rule, only such buildings have been described at length as have been also illustrated by the woodcuts. It would, of course, have been easy to enlarge the text to almost any extent by enumerating or describing other examples; but as nothing can be more unintelligible than a mere verbal description of a building, this has, as far as possible, been avoided, and all that has been aimed at is to assign to the buildings of the Renaissance styles the same relative importance and amount of space as was given to those of the true styles in the previous volumes.

A work of this extent, and with illustrations of the size here adopted, cannot make any pretensions to be considered as a scientific treatise in the ordinary acceptance of the term; great pains have therefore been taken to avoid all technical terms or expressions which might be unintelligible to the general reader. But the word "Order" occurs so often, and is used throughout in so technical a manner, that it may be useful to define exactly in what sense it is employed. The

ancients generally grouped their different styles of ornamentation into three classes : the Doric, or that used by the pure Hellenes, or Dorian Greeks ; the Ionic, used by the Asiatic Greeks, and by the Pelasgi, or Arcadians, in Greece ; and lastly, the Corinthian, which, though probably invented or borrowed from the Egyptians by the Greeks, was the Roman Order *par excellence*. The two first were also used at Rome, but with considerable modifications, which, however, were anything but improvements ; and the Italian Systematists of the sixteenth century added the Tuscan, which they erroneously assumed to be only a simpler form of Doric, and the Composite, which was only one of the hundred modifications of the Corinthian Order as employed by the Romans. Palladio, Vignola, and others of that school, fixed the dimensions, the forms and details of these five Orders, by laws which have since that time been considered immutable. In consequence of this, when speaking of an Order in this work, it will always be understood as referring to one of these five classes as defined by the architects of the sixteenth century. In the sense in which it is here used, an Order always consists of two principal parts,—a vertical column and a horizontal entablature. The column always consists of three parts,—a base, a shaft, and a capital. The entablature, in like manner, always includes an architrave, a frieze, and a cornice. To these the Italians often added a pedestal below and a balustrade above ; but these are not parts of the “Order,” which is always understood to include only the six parts first mentioned.




Diagram explaining the parts of an "Order."

It may add to the clearness of what follows, if before concluding I add one word regarding the position assigned to Mediæval Art in this and the earlier work, though it may appear to be more personal to myself than is quite desirable. When the first two volumes were published, it was objected that I did not appreciate, and consequently did not admire, the Mediæval styles. If the question were only personal, it might be sufficient to reply that a lifetime devoted to their study, which might in the ordinary sense of the term have been far more profitably employed, ought to be a sufficient answer to that accusation. But the case, as I understand it, may be more clearly



stated thus :—No work of human hands is perfect, while it is also true that few honestly elaborated productions of man's intellect are without some peculiar merit of their own ; and on comparing one with the other, it seems as impossible to overlook the merits of the one as to avoid noticing the imperfections of the other. There are few, for instance, but will admit that the Greek style of Architecture possesses a certain purity, an elegance, and a technic perfection, which are wholly wanting in the Gothic. The latter may be infinitely more varied or richer in effects ; more poetic ; more sublime, perhaps—that is not the question—each has merits of its own ; but the man who sees no beauty in the one style, and is blind to the imperfections of the other, is a partisan, and not a historian of the art, and looks at the subject from a totally different point of view from that to which I have always aspired to attain. While admiring, however, the true Mediæval Art with the intensest enthusiasm, I cannot without regret see so much talent employed and so much money wasted in producing imitations of it, which though Gothic in outward appearance, are erected in utter defiance of every principle of Gothic Art. Neither can I look without extreme sorrow on the obliteration of everything that is truthful or worthy of study in our noble cathedrals or beautiful parish churches ; nor do I care to refrain from expressing my dissent from the system which is producing these deplorable results.

If the question is raised which style is most suited to our present purposes ? that is a different matter altogether, on which it is not necessary to enter here, as my views on that subject are sufficiently explained in the body of the work ; but I must be allowed to express a hope that no architect or section of architects will consider that there is anything in the remotest degree personal in any expression in this volume. My conviction is that the architects of the present day have shown themselves thoroughly competent to the task they have undertaken, and would prove equally so to any other that can be proposed to them ; and if they were allowed to exercise their intellects, and not forced to trust only to their memories, they might do something of which we should have cause to be proud ; but they are working on a wrong system and from false premises, so that success seems to be impossible. Still, if the Gothic architects would call themselves "Archæologists," and the Grecians "Scholars," I would bow with due respect to their science or their learning ; but though they might produce temples that would deceive letinns, or churches that would mystify a Wickham or a Waynflete, that would not alter the state of the case ; for I deny that either Archæology or Scholarship is Architecture according to any reasonable definition of the term, or, consequently, that their reproductions have any claim to be treated as specimens of that art in a work especially dedicated to the Esthetic development of the Art of Building.



There is another aspect of the question which in many respects is more sorrowful than even this. In their inconsiderate zeal for Mediæval Art, the Archæologists are fast obliterating all traces of the science they so zealously cultivate. Thirty or forty years ago, if you entered a cathedral in France or England, you at once could say, These arches were built in the age of the Conqueror—that capital belongs to the earlier Henrys—that window tracery must have been executed during the reign of the first or second Edward; or that vault during the Tudor period, and so on. Not only could you fix a date on every part and every detail, but you could read in them the feelings and aspirations that influenced the priest who ordered, or the builder or carver who executed them. All this is now changed. You enter a cathedral and admire some iron-work so rude you are sure it must be old, but which your guide informs you has just been put up by Smith of Coventry. You see some carved monsters so uncouth that no modern imagination could conceive them—"Brown of Cambridge, Sir;"—some painted glass so badly drawn and so crudely coloured it must be old—"Jones of Newcastle." You decipher with difficulty the archaic inscription on some monumental brass, and are startled to find it ending in "A D. 1862;" and so on through the whole church. It is so easy for people who have attained a superior degree of proficiency to imitate the arts of those of a lower stage, that the forgeries are perfect and absolutely undetectable. With a higher class of Art this would be impossible: but the great recommendation of Gothic Art is, that it is so rude that any journeyman can succeed in imitating it; and they have done so till all our grand old buildings are clothed in falsehood, while all our new buildings aim only at deceiving. If this is to continue, Architecture in England is not worth writing about; but it is principally in the hope that a clear exposition of the mistaken system on which the art is now practised may lead to some amelioration that this work has been written. How far it may be successful depends on those who read it, or from its study may be lead to perceive how false and mistaken the principles are on which modern Architecture is based, and how easy, on the contrary, it would be to succeed if we were only content to follow in the same path which has led to perfection in all countries of the world and in all ages preceding that to which the history contained in this volume extends.

[THE QUALIFICATIONS AND ATTITUDE OF THE AUTHOR. There are certain startling suggestions offered in the concluding paragraphs of this Preface which seem to require that the position and attitude of so courageous a critic should be at once more clearly defined. The reader will no doubt be fully prepared to understand that Fergusson was one of the most prominent writers of his day upon the recondite subject of Architecture. In fact, in the public view he was the most prominent of

all. And yet he was not a professional architect. Now it may appear somewhat paradoxical, but it is not, to say that his non-professional position and his non-professional attitude were in a very great degree the secret of his success ; for, in plain words, it was almost essential to such success in England that he should be an amateur. No architect brought up to practical business could find time for so much writing, or especially for so much research. The too technical style, also, of the writer who knows too much of such a subject is not always acceptable, whether to specialists who are well informed or to general readers who are not. An intelligent and cultured amateur, however, going lightly over the ground, may please all ; the unlearned are not mystified and the learned make allowances. During Fergusson's time there were a good many amateurs who were writing freely on architecture—Ruskin, for example, Parker, Leeds, Willis, and any number of local ecclesiologists ; and all were respectfully attended to, even by professional architects—much more, indeed, than their contemporaries who used the pencil and not the pen. The reader, therefore, is not to expect to discover in Fergusson's writings any sense of diffidence, or even of deference to professional superiority. But neither ought the student to be called upon to accept his dicta as if they were the results of a different kind of experience from that which he actually possessed. Moreover, as Fergusson's opinions are exceedingly free, and his language equally outspoken, we may fairly assume it to have been one of the most obvious of his principles that his readers shall think as freely as himself, and express themselves, if they please, as plainly. It must be remembered, also, that Fergusson was one of the most unconquerable and unconvincible of men. Those who recollect the incident will never forget the conclusion which he arrived at, and the words in which he expressed it, as the outcome of his visit to Jerusalem. It had been pointed out to him that his theories respecting the Holy Places were those of one who "had never been there." Very well, he said in effect, now that I have been there, what is the result ? "I have nothing to retract ; and nothing to add !" If the same self-sufficiency pervades the present book, as it does all his books, why should it not ? Hesitating doctrine may appear to be prudent, but is it found to be acceptable ?

The peculiar qualifications with which Fergusson was endowed for the position he eventually assumed as the author of books like this were the possession of a singularly powerful analytical intellect and an accidental but strong inclination towards the study of architecture as a hobby. There is nothing to lead us to believe that a professional education would have made him a distinguished practical architect. The probability perhaps is that he would have drifted, like so many others, into the acceptance of peace with honest mercantile profit at any price, and his books would never have been written. But the young merchant in India, possessed of a fair amount of æsthetic taste and still more of shrewd



philosophy, with ample leisure and enterprise, far removed from the intellectual activities of home, and amusing himself with the curious manifestations that surrounded him, was educating himself unconsciously for a kindred career. The contemplation of the majestic remains of ancient building attracted his attention. Study provoked travel, and travel provoked study. He was more and more fascinated by the venerable repose of Oriental antiquity, and the quaint and stolid simplicities of its long-descended and still active handicrafts. He became a philosophical explorer of the Old Architecture of the East. Then, as he contemplated the mysterious temples of Hindostan, his speculations, by a not unfamiliar instinct, led him backward to the long-lost Temple of Sacred Scripture, more mysterious still. Searching yet closer in his earnestness, the very elements and essences of Art seemed not inaccessible to his investigation ; and it was more than excusable if he dreamed of his return to the prosaic West in the character of a new prophet for the criticism of the Architecture of all time.

There is one question, however, which may here occur to the expert. This Anglo-Indian amateur would of course have two subjects for study offered to him by those strange remains of building. He could investigate either the problems of their construction or the idiosyncrasy of their design. It is enough to say that he devoted himself to design alone. No doubt he would see that the Art of Architecture is the clothing of the Science of Construction ; but it would be idle to deny that, in the examples which he was so assiduously exploring, this interdependence of the Art and the Science was far from conspicuous. It is scarcely too much to say that decorative superficiality is almost the only rule of Oriental effect, the surface of the work dominant everywhere, the subcutaneous structure never accentuated, seldom developed, sometimes not even permitted to assert its existence.

We must not expect to discover, therefore, in Fergusson's philosophy all that we might wish to find, or all that he himself might wish to express, of that particular kind of criticism which turns upon the structuresque. Although a critic by nature, he was not a builder by practice. But he does not fail to see and to teach that the architect must be a Builder or he is no true Architect, and that this is one of the leading doctrines of all advanced architectural wisdom.

There is another point which demands a word of explanation, namely, the anxiety which the author manifests, lest it should be thought he "did not appreciate and consequently did not admire the Mediæval styles." Many readers will require to be reminded that the famous "Battle of the Styles" was at the time of writing being hotly contested, and that Fergusson was publicly recognised as a member of "the Classic party." When he at first settled in London on his return from India, and commenced his career as an architectural critic, in 1845, the doctrinal system of Professors Cockerell and Donaldson was something like the



following.—The architecture of the ancient Greeks was to be accepted dogmatically, as of heroic, if not of almost supermundane origin. That of the Romans, although a deteriorated version of the Hellenic legend, was still scarcely of this poor world. A Spanish ecclesiastic had declared that the Five Orders were delivered to Solomon out of heaven itself; but this went too far. Coming to the Dark Ages, however, the less said of them the better; and even the Middle Ages were as perverse in architecture as in social conditions and religion. The Italians of the sixteenth century, however, by a happy inspiration had reverted to the Roman remains, and their followers to the Greek; and Modern Europe, led by France, was still pursuing the revival of the antique, sometimes successfully, sometimes not. This was "Classicism."—On the other hand, there had been recently growing up in England a certain patriotic liking for the curious work of the Middle Ages, which, under a sort of protest, had to be recognised. In this way "Gothicism" was also being "revived," and had indeed become a rival to Classicism. Not that Classicists could admit the two to be of equal virtue; but they could be liberal in commendation, catholic in criticism, and eclectic in practice.—Thus there were two academical styles, the Classic and the Gothic; and in fact, having regard to the peculiar ecclesiasticism of the time, and its demonstrativeness artistically, there might be no serious objection to the Gothic having a monopoly of church work.—But, under the leadership of Pugin, and before long of Beresford Hope, this compromise was called in question. The Gothic ecclesiastical practitioners and their pupils began to constitute themselves a militant party; and, inasmuch as church-building was acquiring still increasing importance and popularity in the higher architectural practice, and its specialists were growing more and more enthusiastic, not to say violent, in their demeanour, the time soon arrived when the profession of architects was (in the language of Sir Gilbert Scott) divided into "two hostile camps," regarding each other with "mutual scorn." The Gothicists indeed became so courageous as to press the question plainly why the whole dominion of building-art should not be their own. For Classic, they declared, was effete and anomalous altogether, and Gothic the only true and living style.—Thus arose the "Secular Gothic" practice; and it was upon this ground (for there was absolutely no other practical point at issue but the supremacy of Secular Gothic) that the two parties proceeded to fight "the Battle of the Styles." Within a very few years the rival schools had assumed such an attitude that, in the public competition for the Government Offices in 1857, the prizes had to be awarded, for the sake of peace, to representatives of the two styles alternately; which was at least ludicrous. But shortly after this, another opportunity offered for a trial of strength. A President of the Institute of Architects had to be appointed by a vote of the body of Fellows, on the decease of Earl de Grey who had been allowed to hold the position as an honorary

member and patron for some-five-and twenty years. Cockerell, who had retired from active life, was persuaded to accept office for a few months ; and in the meantime the two factions were preparing to join in battle. All the excitement of a parliamentary election was then emulated in the canvassing operations of contending committees, and, when Beresford Hope was defeated by Tite, it was by only so modest a majority that he succeeded on the next occasion unopposed, in formal recognition of the equality of parties.—Thus it was, therefore, that Fergusson, in consequence of his being known to be a Classicist in personal taste, would obviously deem it necessary, as the author of a popular historical work, expressly to cultivate impartiality between these struggling schools ; and so it will be easily understood that any apology he would think it desirable to offer, as he does here, would have for its object to deprecate, on the part of one half of his readers, the very natural idea that he “ did not appreciate, and consequently did not admire, the Mediaeval styles.” Perhaps it is correct to say also that at that particular time the claims of Mediaeval architecture would manifestly gain, and its admirers be all the more pacified, by this recognition of the necessity for expressly allaying their apprehensions ; but there is, however, another guarantee of Fergusson’s impartiality which must carry still more weight than any such assurance could convey. It has to be borne in mind that the only attitude he ever practically assumed amongst professional architects was that of a critic. Indeed, it is his strong point as a writer that he had no educational predilections, and no personal interests as an active man of business. He was in every respect a free-lance. The student-reader may therefore trust to his guidance with perfect confidence. He could not possibly be a Classicist like Donaldson ; nor a Gothicist like Pugin ; nor even an Eclectic like Digby Wyatt ; he was entirely an outsider. The Battle of the Styles has now died out ; it can scarcely be said to have been fought out. The practical contest was between Secular Gothic and Vernacular European ; and both alike have been supplanted for the time in popular favour by a new compromise. Academically, of course, the Vernacular European remains intact ; and practically the “ Flemish Renaissance ” of the passing fashion is the successor of the Secular Gothic ; but if the reader insists upon knowing which is the winner, there are many who will answer that for the present both seem to have lost—a result by no means unknown in other kinds of warfare than this.

The reader may therefore be all the more pleased to find that, even in such circumstances as these, our Author’s courageous criticisms come out of the crucible of his shrewd and candid intelligence with such indisputable impartiality and integrity. The questions which he undertook to examine were not the traditions of scholastic dogmatism, but the merits and demerits of common-sensible Art-workmanship. The architect of his ideal was neither Classic dilettante nor Gothic ecclesiologist ; neither plodding prosaic nor dreaming mystic ; but a scholarly



craftsman, devoting his best energies to the honest and manly exercise of ripened judgment in practical designing ; self-taught in the studio, and self-made on the building, rather than drilled in the academy ; relying much upon intelligent reflection, and very little upon pedantic controversy ; trusting to insight rather than precedent, and to aptitude more than rule ; and so thinking-out for himself, with every care and every confidence, the pleasant problems of his long-descended and admirable Art, for the sake of its acknowledged graciousness and his own continual joy.—ED.]





## THE AUTHOR'S PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION (1873).

IN preparing for the press this New Edition of the 'History of the Modern Styles of Architecture,' the whole text has been carefully revised, not only to correct imperfections, but also to admit of the additional knowledge gained during the last ten years being incorporated in it. This revision has also enabled the author to engraft on the body of the work the experience derived from a tour made through parts of Italy and France, during the spring of last year, with the especial object of verifying or correcting first impressions regarding many important buildings which are the subject of comment in the following pages. The death, too, of several eminent British architects has admitted of their works being described in this new edition, which, on the conditions to which the work is limited, could not be done when it was first published.

With these additions and improvements, it is hoped that the work, as it now stands, may be considered as supplying a want which has hitherto existed in the literature of the subject of which it treats; no modern work of the same scope being known to exist, either in English or in any foreign language, which gives a condensed and popular account of one of the most important—even if not the most perfect—of the styles of Architecture in use among the civilised nations of the world.

When this work was first published, in 1862, it was intended—as is explained in the Preface to the First Edition—to form a sequel to the 'Handbook of Architecture,' published in 1855.

The materials of this Handbook were afterwards re-arranged and enlarged, so as to form the 'History of Architecture,' in two volumes, published in 1867, when this volume still occupied the same relative position as the third and concluding volume of the History. As now reprinted, it is intended to form the Fourth Volume of a new edition of the whole work, which is passing through the press, and which it is intended shall take the following form.

It is proposed to reprint the two volumes of the 'History of Architecture,' with such corrections and additional matter as may be requisite to bring them up to the knowledge of the present day, but leaving out of them all the chapters relating to India. The general history, without India, will thus form a separate work, in two volumes of about 600 pages each, and with not less than 1000 illustrations.

The Indian chapters now occupy 300 pages, with 200 woodcuts. It is proposed to double the extent of the text, and to add at least 100 more illustrations. It will thus form a volume similar in extent to the three others, and will be sold separately. The concluding volume, as before, will be the present one, which brings down the history to the present time.

By this arrangement, those who possess the original work will not find it superseded or its value destroyed by this new edition, unless they feel specially interested in the Indian branch of the subject, and in that case they can obtain the Indian volume separately without the necessity of purchasing the whole work. On the other hand, those who feel an especial interest in India may obtain all that refers to that country in a single volume especially devoted to the subject.

It is intended that the first and second volumes shall be published in November next year, and the Indian volume towards the end of 1875.

*20, Langham Place, September, 1873.*

# CONTENTS.

## VOLUME I.

	PAGE
Editor's Preface to the Third Edition (1891) .. .. .	v
Author's Preface to the First Edition (1862), and the Qualifications and Attitude of the Author .. .. .	ix
Author's Preface to the Second Edition (1873) .. .. .	xix
List of Illustrations .. .. .	xxiii
Sketch of the Life of the Author .. .. .	xxvii

## INTRODUCTION.

The Scheme of the Author—True Styles—Revival of Classic Literature—Reformation in Religion—Painting and Sculpture—Technic and Phonetic Forms of Art—Examples—Ethnography—Conclusion—Comments .. ..	1
--	---

## BOOK I.—ITALY.

### CHAPTER

I.—ECCLESIASTICAL. Churches anterior to St. Peter's—St. Peter's—Churches subsequent to St. Peter's—Domical Churches—Basilican Churches: Exteriors: Interiors .. .. .	61
II.—SECULAR .. .. .	114
I.—FLORENCE .. .. .	117
II.—VENICE .. .. .	125
III.—ROME .. .. .	137
IV.—VICENZA .. .. .	150
V.—GENOA .. .. .	156
VI.—MANTUA .. .. .	162
VII.—MILAN .. .. .	168
VIII.—TURIN, NAPLES, &c. .. .. .	196
IX.—CONCLUSION .. .. .	168
X.—RECENT ARCHITECTURE .. .. .	172



## BOOK II.—SPAIN AND PORTUGAL.

CHAPTER	PAGE
Introduction .. .. .	178
I.—ECCLESIASTICAL .. .. .	181
II.—THE ESCURIAL .. .. .	190
III.—SECULAR .. .. .	197
IV.—PORTUGAL .. .. .	210
V.—RECENT ARCHITECTURE .. .. .	212

## BOOK III.—FRANCE.

Introduction .. .. .	213
I.—ECCLESIASTICAL. Renaissance—Revival .. .. .	219
II.—SECULAR. STYLE OF FRANCIS I. The Louvre—Châteaux .. .. .	240
III.—STYLE OF HENRY IV. .. .. .	258
IV.—STYLE OF LOUIS XIV. Versailles—Louvre—Hôtels .. .. .	265
V.—STYLE OF THE EMPIRE. Domestic—Trophies and Tombs—Conclusion .. .. .	282
VI.—RECENT ARCHITECTURE .. .. .	303

## LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS.

NO.	PAGE	NO.	PAGE
St. Peter's, Rome ( <i>Frontispiece</i> ).		33. Plan of the Church della Salute at Venice .. .. .	95
1. Sistine Chapel, Rome .. .. .	20	34. View of the Dogana and Church della Salute .. .. .	96
2. King's College Chapel, Cambridge .. .. .	21	35. Elevation of principal Façade of the Church of Carignano at Genoa .. .. .	97
3. Fragment from the Pellegrini Chapel, Verona .. .. .	24	36. Church of San Carlo at Milan .. .. .	98
4. House in the Griefswald .. .. .	39	37. Church of San Zaccaria, Venice .. .. .	100
5. House at Brunswick .. .. .	40	38. Church of the Redentore .. .. .	101
6. Grimani Palace .. .. .	41	39. Church of San Giorgio Maggiore, Venice .. .. .	102
7. Valmarina Palace, Vicenza .. .. .	42	40. Church of Sta. Maria Zobenico, Venice .. .. .	104
8. New Cathedral at Boulogne .. .. .	44	41. Interior of San Giorgio Maggiore, Venice .. .. .	106
9. Plan of Church at Moustà .. .. .	46	42. Plan of Church of Redentore, Venice .. .. .	106
10. Section of Church at Moustà .. .. .	47	43. Plan of Sta. Annunziata at Genoa .. .. .	107
11. View of Church at Moustà .. .. .	48	44. View of the Interior of the Church of Sta. Annunziata, Genoa .. .. .	108
12. Plan of Santo Spirito, Florence .. .. .	63	45. Church of St. Paul's outside the Walls, as recently rebuilt .. .. .	111
13. Section of part of Church of Santo Spirito, Florence .. .. .	64	46. Elevation of part of the Façade of Riccardi Palace, Florence .. .. .	118
14. View of the Church of St. Francesco at Rimini .. .. .	65	47. Section of Riccardi Palace, Florence .. .. .	119
15. Plan of St. Andrea at Mantua .. .. .	66	48. Cornice of Pitti Palace, Florence .. .. .	120
16. Section of St. Andrea at Mantua .. .. .	67	49. Part of the Façade of the Eucellai Palace, Florence .. .. .	122
17. Elevation of Porch of St. Andrea at Mantua .. .. .	68	50. Guadagni Palace, Florence .. .. .	123
18. Plan of Church at Todi .. .. .	69	51. North-Eastern Angle of Courtyard in Doge's Palace, Venice .. .. .	127
19. Section of Church at Todi .. .. .	70	52. Vandramini Palace, Venice .. .. .	129
20. Elevation of Church at Todi .. .. .	71	53. End Elevation of Palazzo, Camerlinghi, Venice .. .. .	130
21. Santa Maria delle Grazie, Milan .. .. .	72	54. End Elevation of Library of St. Mark, Venice .. .. .	132
22. View of Western Façade of the Certosa, near Pavia .. .. .	74	55. Pesaro Palace, Venice .. .. .	135
23. Plan of St. Peter's as proposed by Bramante .. .. .	76	56. Part of the Façade of the Cancelleria at Rome .. .. .	139
24. Plan of St. Peter's as proposed by Sangallo .. .. .	77	57. Block Plan of the Farnese Palace at Rome .. .. .	141
25. Elevation of East Front of St. Peter's according to Sangallo's design .. .. .	79	58. Garden front of the Farnese Palace, Rome .. .. .	142
26. Diagram suggesting arrangement of aisles in Sangallo's elevation .. .. .	80	59. Museum in the Capitol at Rome .. .. .	143
27. Plan of St. Peter's as it now exists .. .. .	81	60. Villa of Pope Julius, near Rome .. .. .	145
28. Elevation of the Western Apse of St. Peter's .. .. .	83	61. Plan of the Palace of Caprarola .. .. .	146
29. East Front of St. Peter's .. .. .	84		
30. Section of St. Peter's .. .. .	88		
31. View of the lateral Porch of San Giovanni Laterano .. .. .	92		
32. Principal Façade of the Church of San Giovanni Laterano .. .. .	93		



NO.	PAGE	NO.	PAGE
62. Palace of Caprarola, near Rome .. ..	146	98. Façade of the Church of St. Michael at Dijon .. ..	215
63. Façade of the Collegio della Sapienza .. ..	147	99. Plan of St. Eustache, Paris .. ..	219
64. Cortile of the Borghese Palace .. ..	148	100. Bay of St. Eustache .. ..	220
65. View of the Barberial Palace, Rome .. ..	149	101. Part of Façade of Church of St. Paul and St. Louis, Paris .. ..	222
66. Part of Façade of the Tieze Palace, Vicenza .. ..	151	102. Jesuit style of decoration .. ..	223
67. Elevation of Chiericato Palace, Vicenza .. ..	152	103. Plan of the Dome of the Invalides at Paris .. ..	224
68. Barbarano Palace, Vicenza .. ..	153	104. Section of Dome of the Invalides at Paris .. ..	225
69. Villa del Capra, near Vicenza .. ..	154	105. Façade of the Dome of the Invalides at Paris .. ..	226
70. End Elevation of Basilica at Vicenza .. ..	155	106. Façade of St. Sulpice, Paris, as originally designed .. ..	228
71. Durazzo Palace, Genoa .. ..	158	107. Plan of the Purch of St. Sulpice .. ..	228
72. Tursi Doria Palace, Genoa .. ..	158	108. Plan of the Pantheon at Paris .. ..	230
73. Part of Façade of Carega Palace, Genoa .. ..	159	109. View of the West Front of the Pantheon at Paris .. ..	231
74. Little Brignola Palace, Genoa .. ..	161	110. Section of the Dome of the Pantheon at Paris .. ..	232
75. Great Court of the Hospital at Milan .. ..	164	111. Pier supporting Dome of Pantheon .. ..	233
76. Portion of the Façade of the Palace of the Caserta at Naples .. ..	167	112. Plan of the Madeleine at Paris .. ..	235
76a. <i>Fine Art Galleries, Rome</i> .. ..	174	113. Plan of the Louvre and Tuileries, distinguishing the periods at which the various parts have been completed .. ..	243
76b. <i>Building on the Corso, Rome</i> .. ..	175	114. Pavillon de l'Horloge and part of Louvre Court .. ..	244
76c. <i>Victor Emmanuel Gallery, Milan</i> .. ..	176	115. Part of the Court of the Louvre .. ..	245
77. Plan of the Cathedral at Granada .. ..	182	116. Plan of Château de Chambord .. ..	247
78. Capital of Cathedral at Jaen .. ..	184	117. Château of Chambord .. ..	248
79. Puerta de las Cadenas, Cathedral of Malaga .. ..	185	118. Château of Madrid .. ..	250
80. Plan of the Cathedral at Valladolid .. ..	186	119. Plan of the Château de Bury .. ..	251
81. Plan of the Cathedral del Pilar at Zaragoza .. ..	187	120. Château de Bury .. ..	252
82. View of the Cathedral del Pilar at Zaragoza .. ..	188	121. Bay of the Episcopal Palace at Sens .. ..	254
83. Tower of the Seo, Zaragoza .. ..	189	122. House of Agnes Sorel at Orleans .. ..	255
84. Plan of the Escorial .. ..	191	123. Window-head, Hôtel Vogüé, Dijon .. ..	256
85. Bird's-eye View of the Escorial .. ..	192	124. Canopy of Tomb of Cardinal Amboise at Rouen .. ..	257
86. Section through the Church and Atrium of the Escorial .. ..	193	125. Central Pavilion of the Tuileries, as designed by De Lorme .. ..	259
87. Court of the Archbishoppal Palace at Alcalá de los Hernáez .. ..	198	126. Portion of the Façade of the Château Gaillon .. ..	260
88. Pafanmfo, Alcalá .. ..	199	127. Pavillon Flore of the Tuileries, and part of the Gallery of the Louvre .. ..	261
89. View in the Cloister at Lupiana .. ..	200	128. Plan of the Luxembourg .. ..	262
90. Court in the Palace of the Infanta at Zaragoza .. ..	201	129. Elevation of a portion of the Courtyard of the Luxembourg .. ..	263
91. Plan of the Palace of Charles V. in the Alhambra .. ..	202	130. Part of the Château de Blois .. ..	266
92. Part Elevation, part Section, of the Palace of Charles V. at Granada .. ..	203	131. Plan of Versailles as it now exists .. ..	268
93. View of the external Façade of the Alcazar at Toledo .. ..	204	132. Section of Great Gallery and part Elevation of central block, Versailles .. ..	269
94. View of the Palace at Madrid .. ..	205	133. Plan of Façade of Louvre .. ..	272
95. The Museo at Madrid .. ..	207	134. Eastern Façade of the Louvre, Paris .. ..	272
96. Carcel del Corté at Baena .. ..	208		
97. Palace at Mafra .. ..	211		

# LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS.

XXV

NO.	PAGE	NO.	PAGE
135. Central Compartment, Northern Façade of Louvre .. ..	273	146. Custom House, Rouen .. ..	291
136. Château de Meudon, Garden Front	274	147. House, Rue Soufflot .. ..	292
137. Château de Maisons, near Paris	275	148. Rue des Saussaies .. ..	293
138. Façade of the Hôtel Soubise ..	276	149. House, Rue Navarin .. ..	294
139. Hôtel de Noailles .. ..	277	150. Colonne de Juillet, on the site of the Bastille .. ..	295
140. Louis Quatorze Decoration ..	279	151. Porte St. Denis .. ..	297
141. Louis Quatorze style of Decora- tion .. ..	280	152. Elevation of the Arc de l'Etoile	298
142. View of the Bourse, Paris ..	283	153. Entrance to the Ecole Polytech- nique .. ..	299
143. View of the Angle of the Place Louis Napoleon, new buildings of Louvre .. ..	286	153a. Hôtel-de-Ville, Paris .. ..	308
144. Angle of the Library of Ste. Geneviève, Paris .. ..	289	153b. Faculty of Medicine, Paris ..	309
145. New Bourse, Lyons .. ..	290	153c. National Library, Paris .. ..	310
		153d. School of Art, Marseilles ..	312
		153e. Church of Ste. Hilaires, Rouen	313

*Erratum.*—Vol. I. pp. 69, 70, 71, for *Lodi*, read *Todi*.







## JAMES FERGUSSON:

A SKETCH OF HIS LIFE.<sup>1</sup>

BY WILLIAM H. WHITE,

*Secretary of the Royal Institute of British Architects.*

JAMES FERGUSSON, C.I.E., D.C.L. Oxon., LL.D. Edin., F.R.S., F.G.S., Vice-President of the Royal Asiatic Society, a Past Vice-President of the Royal Institute of British Architects, a Member of the Council of the Royal Geographical Society, a Member of the Society of Dilettanti, and of other learned bodies, was born at Ayr in Scotland, on the 22nd of January, 1808. His father, Dr. William Fergusson, author of 'Notes and Recollections of a Professional Life,' was a man of some mark, who had seen service in various parts of the world, having been present on the Flag ship at Copenhagen in 1801, principal medical officer at the taking of Oporto, in the passage of the Douro, and at Talavera; and who, after serving in the West Indies, went to live at Edinburgh in the year 1817. James, the younger of Dr. Fergusson's two sons, had consequently the opportunity of beginning his education at the High School of that city. He entered Mr. Irvine's first class there in 1818, and in the following year was in the second class. Dr. Fergusson, however, left Edinburgh in 1821, and at the invitation of H. R. H. the Duke of Gloucester, on whose staff he had acted in France, settled at Windsor, where he ultimately obtained a large and lucrative practice as a physician.<sup>2</sup> The subject of this notice was then sent to a private school at Hounslow, and as he was destined for employment in the firm of Fairlie, Fergusson, and Co., of Calcutta, with which his family had been long connected, and in which his elder brother was a partner, his early education was neither academical nor classical. On the contrary, it was of a very ordinary character. The firm, however, failed soon after James Fergusson's arrival in India, and he became an indigo planter. He also, in conjunction with his brother William, started an independent house of business in Calcutta, from which he

<sup>1</sup> This notice was first published in the Annual Report for 1886 of the Royal Asiatic Society, and is here reprinted by the kind consent of the Council of that

Society with additions by the writer.

<sup>2</sup> See Dr. Fergusson's 'Notes and Recollections of a Professional Life,' edited by James Fergusson. London, 1846, 8vo.



fortune to spend the best years of my life in countries where Art, though old and decrepit, still follows the same path that led it towards perfection in the days of its youth and vigour, and, though it may be effete, it is not insane. In the East, men still use their reason in speaking of art, and their common sense in carrying their views into effect. They do not, as in modern Europe, adopt strange hallucinations that can only lead to brilliant failures; and, in consequence, though we may feel inclined to despise results, they are perfection itself compared with what we do, when we take into account the relative physical and moral means of the Asiatic and the Anglo-Saxon. . . . A course of study pursued among the products of art themselves in this manner I have found far more instructive than books of theories are or perhaps ever can be, and I believe all would find it so if they could follow it in such circumstances as would prevent their being influenced by the errors of bad education, or free them from the trammels of the stereotyped opinions of the age. The belief that it has been so to me induces me now to publish the result of my experience. I believe I see the path which other and cleverer men have mistaken; and as the veriest cripple who progresses in the right direction will beat the strongest pedestrian who chooses a wrong path, I trust to being able to instruct even those before whose superior knowledge and abilities I would otherwise bow in silence."

At the end of the same preface he tells how he had even then put aside entirely the subject of that volume to give every thought and every spare moment to the science of fortification, his head being wholly filled with "walls of brick and mounds of earth of the most murderous form and most utilitarian ugliness." In 1849 he published his 'Proposed New System of Fortification,' the main feature of which was the proposal of earthworks in place of masonry—then a most unfashionable doctrine, though now universally adopted. He further illustrated his ideas by printing a pamphlet entitled 'The Perils of Portsmouth, or French Fleets and English Forts,' the third edition of which appeared in 1853, whereby he forcibly directed public attention to the dangerous insecurity of that great military and naval port; and this was followed in 1856 by a sequel entitled 'Portsmouth Protected . . . with Notes on Sebastopol and other Sieges during the Present War.' The reputation obtained from these works caused him to be appointed a Member of the Royal Commission for the Defences of the United Kingdom.

He contributed to the 'Transactions' of the Royal Institute of British Architects papers of great value, namely, in 1849, on 'The History of the Pointed Arch;' in 1850, on 'The Architecture of Southern India;' in 1851, on 'The Architecture of Nineveh;' in 1854, on 'The Architectural Splendour of the City of Bijapur,' and 'The Great Dome of Muhammad's Tomb, Bijapur.' During the following year appeared his 'Illustrated Handbook of Architecture,' in two volumes, a work under-

taken by him at the request of Mr. John Murray, and afterwards enlarged into four closely printed, profusely illustrated octavo volumes, containing the 'History of Ancient and Mediæval Architecture' (2 vols.), the 'History of the Modern Styles of Architecture' (1 vol.), and the 'History of Indian and Eastern Architecture' (1 vol.), the last one bearing the date of 1876; and it may be added that, of all the many volumes which bear Fergusson's name on the title-page, these are perhaps the only works from which he derived any emolument, the majority of his writings having been brought out at his own cost for the edification of a necessarily small number of readers.

An important characteristic of Fergusson's labours lay in the courage with which he maintained the opinions he had once given to the world. All or most of his so-called theories were started early in life, and they were seldom if ever withdrawn as untenable, though capable, as he often admitted, of obvious modification. In his first great architectural effort, 'The Principles of Beauty,' &c., published in 1849, he devoted a portion (pp. 385-393) to the mode in which the ancient Greek Temples were lighted. It seemed to him, even then, absurd to suppose that while the Egyptians had been so long familiar with the "clearstory," by which he translated the word *ἀπαύριον*, the architects of ancient Greece should have remained in ignorance of it; and he contended that they were too artistic, either to shut out the light of day from their temples, as some thought, or to expose an ivory statue to the atmosphere even of Athens, as the text of Pausanias was interpreted to imply. He treated the same subject on a similar basis at a meeting of the Royal Institute of British Architects in 1861; and having prepared a large model of the Parthenon, complete, with its roof and "clearstory," as he believed it originally existed, he wrote as late as 1883, 'The Parthenon: an Essay on the mode by which light was introduced in Greek and Roman Temples'—a subject of the utmost interest to architects and artists, as well as to archaeologists, but one which, during all the years that passed while he was writing about it, failed to elicit anything like enthusiasm either from theoretical critics or from practical men. On other ground further east Fergusson's perseverance was attended with more immediate success. In 1847 he published a work in large octavo form entitled 'An Essay on the Ancient Topography of Jerusalem,' grounded on the plans and measurements of Catherwood, Arundale, and Bonomi who by a singular chance had been employed by the Turks to repair the so-called "Mosque of Omar" in Jerusalem, and had seized the opportunity to make complete drawings of the edifice. In this remarkable essay he contended that the present Church of the Holy Sepulchre does not cover the true burial-place of our Saviour, but that the true site of the Holy Sepulchre is the "Dome of the Rock," where the "Mosque of Omar" now stands, which building he believed, from the evidence of the architecture, to be the identical Church erected by Constantine the Great



over the tomb of our Saviour at Jerusalem. The work fell, to use his own word, "stillborn." But in 1860 an article appeared in the *Edinburgh Review*, on "The Churches of the Holy Land," and Fergusson replied to it, the following year, with a pamphlet entitled, 'Notes on the Site of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem,' in which he repeated his contention and concluded with expressing his belief that in a very short time it would be generally acknowledged that he was right. A storm of opposition to this theory was thereby raised, but at the same time the idea of making an accurate survey of the Holy City was induced by the novel views he advocated, and carried out at the cost of Miss (now Lady) Burdett Coutts by Capt. (now Sir) C. W. Wilson, R.E. At the same time his personal influence was rapidly increasing, and his views gained adherents. I have it on the authority of Sir George Grove, his colleague at the Crystal Palace, his collaborateur in the Dictionary of the Bible, and his intimate friend, that the Palestine Exploration Fund had its origin in a remark of Fergusson's addressed to him during the building of the Assyrian House in the Crystal Palace at Sydenham, in the year 1853—a complaint that there was no exhaustive and accurate Concordance of the Proper Names of the Bible. Nor did he confine himself to influence. His purse was open for the prosecution of his favourite investigations, when he had confidence in the investigator. The first large map of the *Haram Area* at Jerusalem was drawn at his cost. In a letter to the *Times*, published on the 17th of January, 1886, about a week after Fergusson's death, Colonel Sir C. W. Wilson, R.E., wrote: "It was Mr. Fergusson who enabled me to make those tentative excavations at Jerusalem in 1865, which led the way to the better known, and much more extensive excavations which were afterwards carried out by Sir Charles Warren for the Palestine Exploration Fund. In forwarding the necessary funds Mr. Fergusson, with characteristic fairness, wrote, 'Dig wherever you like; you cannot dig anywhere without adding something to our knowledge of Jerusalem; and if you want more money, you can have it.' It is also no secret, I believe, that Mr. Fergusson was prepared to pay the cost of certain excavations in the *Haram Area*, on the result of which he acknowledged his theories must stand or fall, and that the persistent refusal of the Sultan to allow excavations to be made in that area alone prevented him from putting his theories to practical test." His views on Jerusalem topography and on the Temple are given in a condensed form in two remarkable articles in the 'Dictionary of the Bible,' vols. i. and ii.

Fergusson continued his inquiries into the subject with unabated persistency, and in 1878 published a work of more than three hundred quarto pages, fully illustrated with plates and woodcuts, on 'The Temples of the Jews and the other buildings in the *Haram Area* at Jerusalem,' in which he maintained his original opinions in respect of

the Mosque of Omar, as being the original church erected by Constantine, and developed them by learned and minute historical references.

The facts brought to light by the publication of the Marquis de Vögné's book on '*Syrie Centrale*,' formed a subject of intense interest to him, and through his influence the Royal Gold Medal for Architecture, which has been given annually since 1848 by Her Majesty the Queen to some architect or man of science of any country, was offered to and accepted by the Marquis in 1879. Nor is it any secret that the recommendations for this honour, made by the Royal Institute of British Architects in 1883 on behalf of Mr. Penrose, and in 1885 on behalf of Dr. Schliemann, were brought about by Fergusson's earnest advocacy. Some years previously, in 1871, he had received it himself for "patient and zealous industry, and power, as an architectural historian, and for the faithfulness, ability, and truthfulness with which he had fulfilled his task," the words used by the late Thomas H. Wyatt, when, as President, he presented the Royal Medal to Fergusson.

In 1867 Fergusson described to the Royal Asiatic Society the Amravati Tope in Gantûr, and illustrated his subject with the aid of photographs and casts. This was the year of the Great Exhibition at Paris, where, with the consent of the British Government, a large collection of photographs of Indian Architecture, including the Tope, was being exhibited in the Indian Court, and the facts connected with the collection are so identified with Fergusson and his method of research, and are also so interesting, told as they are by himself, that they should find a place in his Memoir. Having just completed the '*History of Architecture*,' and enjoying, consequently, some leisure, he accepted, on the suggestion of the late Sir Henry Cole, the task of arranging a number of photographs of Indian Architecture, for the Paris Exhibition, and he proposed that some casts of sculpture or some architectural fragments should be added, to enable students to judge of the merit of the objects from actual specimens of the work. But the necessity of making such casts was obviated by the discovery that portions of an Indian monument—the Amravati Tope—were then in London. These marbles had been excavated as far back as 1845, and sent to Madras, where they had lain exposed to wind and rain for some ten or twelve years. They had then been sent to England, and no room having been found for them in the India Museum, they were deposited at Fife House, in a disused coach-house, where Fergusson found them. The marbles were then photographed, the photographs were pieced together, and thereby two elevations of the outer Rail, and one of the inner Rail, of the Amravati Tope, were obtained. "During the three or four months," to use his own words, "which I had spent poring over these photographs, I had not only become familiar with their forms, but had acquired a considerable amount of unexpected knowledge of ancient Indian art and



mythology"—the greater part of which, he afterwards adds, was quite new to him.

These marbles and photographs, and the Paper respecting them contributed to the Royal Asiatic Society, were the prelude to a work which was prepared by Fergusson under the authority of the Secretary of State for India in Council, and published in 1868, namely, 'Tree and Serpent Worship: or Illustrations of Mythology and Art in India, in the first and fourth centuries after Christ, from the Sculptures of the Buddhist Topes at Sanchi and Amravati.' Lord Iddesleigh, then Sir Stafford Northcote and in office, had entered warmly into Fergusson's views on this subject, and the Council had granted permission, and also the necessary funds, to publish all the information then possessed regarding the Amravati Tope; moreover Fergusson, in the course of his investigations at the Library of the India Office, had lighted on a beautiful series of drawings of the Sanchi Tope made in 1854, and at the same time there arrived from India a set of photographs of the same monument. The result was eminently gratifying to Fergusson. A very valuable work, upon a subject which may ultimately obtain further elucidation, was thus placed at public disposal for a comparatively small sum—a work to which General Cunningham and others contributed important appendices.

The perplexed questions connected with megalithic remains next occupied Fergusson's attention, although the subject was not unfamiliar to him, seeing that he had written an article on Stonehenge, which appeared, in July 1860, in the *Quarterly Review*, and another in the same *Review* in April 1870, which was entitled 'Non-Historic Times.' His contention with regard to these singular and inexplicable remains was that they are by no means so old as antiquaries wish to believe, and his 'Rude Stone Monuments in all Countries: their Age and Uses,' treated of remains known to exist not only in Europe, but also in Asia and America.

Prior to this, a new post had been created at the Office of Her Majesty's Works and Public Buildings, with the avowed object of securing Fergusson's services there. In January 1869 he was appointed by the then First Commissioner (Mr. A. H. Layard) "Secretary of Works and Buildings," but the business he was expected to do was not to his taste. A Committee was consequently called together, consisting of two Treasury officials and the late Mr. Austin, who stated in their Report that the First Commissioner required the aid of an officer conversant in a high degree with architecture, in reference to questions connected with existing or contemplated buildings, and on their advice Fergusson's new title was altered to "Inspector of Public Buildings and Monuments." His recommendations, however, were not adopted in one important instance, namely, that of the recently-erected Royal Courts of Justice, and he retired at the first opportunity which offered. The fact

was much to be regretted, not for Fergusson's, but for the country's sake, and a Memorandum (11 March, 1869), on the subject of the appointment is in the highest degree instructive. In it Sir A. H. Layard wrote that the office held by Fergusson was one imperatively required for the public service, and that "had such an officer been connected with the Office of Works, many things which have brought discredit on the Department might have been avoided."

Fergusson was often consulted on architectural questions by authorities of various kinds, and buildings were erected from his designs, notably the picture gallery containing Miss North's wonderful paintings in Kew Gardens, in which he put into actual practice his life-long theory of the mode of lighting Greek temples. He was also an active member of the several committees engaged in the difficult task of completing St. Paul's Cathedral.

Between his first and second contribution to the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* a gap of years intervenes. These contributions are :—

Vol. VIII. (Original Series) Art. II.—On the Rock-cut Temples of India, read 5th December, 1843, containing 10 plates.

Vol. III. (New Series) Art. V.—Description of the Amravati Tope in Gautúr, read 1868.

Vol. IV. (New Series) Art. II.—On Indian Chronology, read 15th February, 1869.

Vol. VI. (New Series) Art. IX.—On Hienou-Thsang's Journey from Patna to Ballabhi.

Vol. XI. (New Series) Art. VIII.—On the identification of the portrait of Chosroes II. among the paintings in the Caves of Ajunta.

Vol. XII. (New Series) page 105.—Remarks on Mr. Robert Sewell's 'Note on Hienou-Thsang's Dhanakacheka.'

——— Art. IX.—On the Saka, Samvat, and Gupta Eras, being a supplement to the author's paper on Indian Chronology.

——— page 139.—Notes on Babu Rájendralála Mitra's paper on the age of the Caves at Ajunta.

Dr. Rájendralála Mitra, whose name is last mentioned, is the author of many papers connected with Indian Archaeology, as well as of two considerable works, one of which (on Buddha Gáya) was published under the orders of the Government of Bengal, and the other (on the Antiquities of Orissa) under those of the Government of India, he having been attached to an archaeological mission which, in 1869, visited the Katak Caves, examined hurriedly by Fergusson in 1837. The result not being satisfactory to the latter, he urged the desirability of sending another expedition to these Caves, under European guidance, and offered to pay the expenses of it should the Government decline to bear them. This led to a controversy of somewhat acrimonious



character, and the strength of Fergusson's convictions was often expressed by him with an almost unnecessary strength of language, which may, however, be largely excused on account of the personal character of many of the attacks with which he was assailed. Irritated and indignant, he published, perhaps unwisely, in 1884, a pamphlet entitled '*Archæology in India*,' in which, as he wrote in the preface, he took an opportunity of saying a few last words on some points of that subject which recent study had rendered clearer to him than they were before, and Dr. Rajendralala Mitra's works became a convenient peg on which to hang his observations. But in such discussions, especially upon Indian matters, even his opponents were his debtors. Fergusson, by his individual efforts, without a jot of encouragement from the Government, with no existing criteria which could enable him to form a judgment of the age or style of the buildings he was studying, classified them, and laid the solid foundations of an architectural chronology for Hindustan. Undoubtedly some of the most remarkable edifices of that country had been visited and partially described, both by the illustrious François Bernier and by other travellers, French and English, of the seventeenth century, as well as by later writers, among whom Heber may be prominently mentioned; and these edifices had been even drawn, though imperfectly, by Daniell and others. But until Fergusson began to systematise the result of his laborious examinations, and to publish his studies of the historical monuments in stone and marble scattered over the face of India, the mass of these and their mutual affinities were like a sealed book to the learning and intelligence of the world. It is not too much to assert that the present votaries of Indian research owe to him the means of checking historical tradition by easy reference to the substantial records with which, principally through his works, they are now familiar.

It would not be right to terminate a memoir written for the Royal Asiatic Society without mentioning the Paper which Fergusson contributed to the *Quarterly Journal of the Geological Society*, for August 1863, on "*Recent Changes in the Delta of the Ganges*." He had resided as a planter for five years on the banks of one of the most active of the Bengal rivers, and had been a witness of some of the changes he described. When, as he states, he first became aware of the disturbance that was taking place around him, he set himself to measure and observe what was passing, and in 1835 made a sketch survey of the Lower Ganges and Brahmaputra from Jaffiergange to the sea. This was published soon afterwards, and his Paper read to the Geological Society was illustrated with a map of the rivers of Bengal showing the changes since Rennell's survey. Such wide versatility of genius was all the more remarkable from the fact that his views on subjects of the most varied nature requiring study and ability of the most distinct character, and information from sources totally opposed to and distant



from each other, were neither superficial nor cursory, but on the contrary were carefully thought out and illustrated generally with direct evidence of skill and learning. Besides those enumerated, he has written articles for periodicals, and letters without end which have been published in the newspapers, and his last contribution of this kind appeared in the *Nineteenth Century*, for November 1885, on "The Restoration of Westminster Hall." Seized the following month with a second attack of paralysis, he died on the 9th of January, 1886, in the seventy-eighth year of his age.

"Those," says an old and intimate associate, "who only knew Fergusson in a business or an official capacity, and thus came into contact with his rough exterior alone, can have little idea of what a very affectionate and even tender side there was to his character. To those whom he loved he was devoted, and the number was greater than many would suspect. As a son and a brother few equalled him in unwearied care and thoughtful attention; and besides relatives, there are many friends of all classes who would gladly testify—if such things were not too sacred for open testimony—to the charm of his friendship, the firm attachment with which he had inspired them during a long intercourse of unvarying pleasantness, and their deep sorrow at his death."

\*     \*     \*     \*     \*

SINCE the foregoing notice was published, extracts from some of the letters written by Fergusson to his sister (the wife of the Rector of Rugby), during his travels in India in the years 1834-39 have appeared in the 'Journal of Proceedings' of the Royal Institute of British Architects; and when it is remembered that his earliest studies, which were to lead to the production of a History of Architecture, were made in Bengal and the North-West Provinces, the mental processes by which he arrived at his conclusions—now partially revealed—become intensely interesting. His first visit to Benares, made in 1834, aroused the enthusiasm with which in those days he was plentifully endowed. Arriving late at night on the bank of the Ganges opposite the Holy City, he had his palanquin put down by the water's edge and slept there, so that before daybreak he might, to use his words, "watch the city stealing out of darkness into sunshine and beauty." The boat in which he crossed the river was "a proper clumsy one," and the boatmen were an hour and a half getting her over, though, wrote Fergusson, "I could have wished the passage ten times as long, as it gave me an excellent opportunity of seeing leisurely all the principal ghauts of the city, and of seeing the whole under various points of view." Everything at this first visit appears "much finer and more magnificent" than he had anticipated, but he is "dazzled" with Agra later on, when "the enthusiasm of boyhood," he writes, is restored to him. In 1838, during the rains, he devoted three weeks to a trip to Orissa, journeying seven hundred miles—a holiday trip during which he slept twenty out of the twenty-one nights in his palanquin; and the same year he made his third visit to Benares, returning with feelings of disappointment. It was only then, he adds, "after having studied far more deeply than I had hitherto done the

architecture of other nations, and above all seen the gigantic and beautiful temples of Orissa, that I now feel what Benares wants." The same year he was at Lucknow for the second time, struck with "the magnificence of the moving mass, the numerous and splendid *sencarri* [the horsemen, elephants, and followers generally of a great man] that at all hours of the day crowd its thoroughfares. In the Company's cities there is no splendour of equipage or dress, every one goes on foot and in plain muslin. . . . At Lucknow, no man with any pretensions to respectability goes out without half a dozen of footmen in gay liveries moving alongside, and as many horsemen with spears and matchlocks prancing before and behind his palanquin. . . . Then at night, when lit by the flare of a thousand torches—how beautiful! All this may be false glare, and hide much misery and oppression beneath it, but who does not love to read of the gay pageants of our forefathers when in the same state of advancement as these people are? or who does not love to gaze on the poor imitations of them sometimes you get up at coronations or civic feasts?" After that he was at Futtehpoor Sikri, at Deeg, at Goverdhn, at Bindrabun, at Muttra, as his letters show; and it is only in his last published letter dated 16th March, 1839, that he tells of the kind of life he often led in these journeys through India. "I wish you had seen the great and wealthy Mr. Fergusson," he writes, "carefully untying some bundles of hay and exercising his taste for luxury in the manner in which he arranged his blanket over them in the corner of a miserable hovel which was his abode. Everything is done by himself, down to making his own bed and cooking his own dinner—not that these are operations of much difficulty or mystery, as the former consists merely of a frame with a blanket over it, and a pillow with a sword under it; and the latter consists generally of scones, which being the food of all his followers as well as of their lord, are always procured in abundance." A perusal of these letters suffices to show that Fergusson, the student and explorer, was a warmhearted, impressionable observer, not a mere architectural statistician, as many of his critics would like to dub him, but an ardent lover of the beautiful, whether of form or colour, and capable of appreciating it from a high critical standpoint. That in his ultimate judgment of architecture and its monuments he leaned rather to the technic than the æsthetic side is only saying that in this he followed the example of Vitruvius, Palladio, and Perrault, and even of the practitioner Wren; but that the æsthetic sense in him was originally deficient or undeveloped is disproved by his early writings. He certainly regarded Design in Architecture as something higher than a mere matter of picturesque grouping or scenic effect; and a short time before his death he expressed to me the satisfaction he felt at having lived long enough to witness the beginning of the end of that period of artistic unreality which had endured during the greater part of his life.

W. H. W.

London, January 1891.



# HISTORY OF THE MODERN STYLES OF ARCHITECTURE.

## INTRODUCTION.

[THE SCHEME OF THE AUTHOR.—To the student of Architectural Art this prefatory Essay may be specially recommended for careful reading. It is the author's preliminary statement of the doctrinal essence of his treatise, and is intended to establish at the outset an understanding with the reader, which he intends to be never lost sight of—a critical bargain between the two in which the reader has to do his part if their connection is to prove satisfactory. "In this *History of the Modern Styles of Architecture*," we can fancy the author to be saying, "I am presenting to you, not a mere book of reference in which you are to discover the date, description, and authorship of one edifice and another, as occasion may require or curiosity dictate; not a mere chronological record of events in connection with building, which you are to esteem only according to its accuracy and completeness; not a cautious and colourless statement of selected facts, avoiding the controversial ground of opinion lest you and I should fall out by the way; but a certain philosophical view of the subject which is my own, a doctrinal theory of progression—or perhaps non-progression—development or non-development—which it is my object to work out by illustration in my own way, and which in this *Introduction*, I will now proceed to explain." Accordingly, in another work (see preface to the First Edition of the *History of Architecture*), the author expresses his motive in the following significant *apologia* :—

"It was my good fortune to be able to devote many years of my life to the study of Architecture—as a fine art—under singularly favourable circumstances; not only was I able to extend my personal observations to the examples found in almost all the countries between China and the Atlantic shore, but I lived familiarly among a people who were still practising their traditional art on the same principles as those which guided the architects of the Middle Ages in the production of similar but scarcely more beautiful or more original works. With these antecedents, I found myself in possession of a considerable amount of information regarding buildings which had not previously been



described, and—what I considered of more value—of an insight into the theory of the art, which certainly was even more novel.”

It was therefore, he goes on to say, that he wrote his essay on *True Principles of Beauty in Art*. The book, he admits, was a failure; but his subsequent series of historical treatises, of which the present one is the last in order, must be taken as a substitute for it, another version of that very work in expanded form. It would take “fifty volumes and twenty thousand woodcuts” at the least, he adds, to accomplish what he had in his mind—for he was a man of large ideas—but he would content himself with these four volumes; and not only so, but he would have preferred at one time to designate the whole series as only *An Historical Introduction to the Study of Architecture, considered as a Fine Art*: and so we have volumes the first and second as a history of Ancient Architecture, volume the third as a history of Indian Architecture, and this volume, the fourth, as a history of Modern Architecture. In a lengthy introduction to the first of these volumes, he reproduces the argument which had constituted his “*True Principles*,” systematically set out; in like manner, as an introduction to this fourth volume, he now clenches the old argument by exposing the particular form in which *False Principles*, as he thinks, have always dominated, and still dominate, the designing of modern architects. Thus it is that the very opening words of the present “Introduction” are these:—“The styles of Architecture which have been described in the previous parts of this work” (meaning the three volumes of history applying to the Ancient World and India) “are those which may be called the True Styles. Those that remain to be examined” (meaning everything that has been done since the establishment in one country after another of “the Renaissance” or the revival of the Antique) “may in like manner be designated the Copying or Imitative Styles.” This is the text of his sermon the enunciation of his leading proposition, the thesis of his discourse, the essential point of his historical argument, and the purpose of its illustration.

In plainer words, all Modern Architecture, he seems to say, is only Sham Art. But of course the reader may form his own judgment of an allegation so remarkable.—Ed.]

### I.—TRUE STYLES.

The Styles of Architecture which have been described in the previous parts of this work,<sup>1</sup> are those which may be called the True Styles. Those that remain to be examined may in like manner be designated the Copying or Imitative Styles of Architectural Art, and differ from the preceding so essentially, that it is indispensable the distinction should be clearly appreciated and always borne in mind, in

<sup>1</sup> The volumes on “Ancient Architecture” and the “Architecture of India.”

order that any just or reasonable judgment may be formed as to their relative merits.

All the buildings belonging to the first class were—without one single exception—arranged solely for the purpose of meeting, in the most direct manner, the wants of those for whom they were designed ; and the ornamentation that was applied to them either grew naturally out of the construction, or was such as was best suited to express the uses or objects to which the building was to be applied.

The immediate consequence of this is that, whether the construction of a building of this class is mechanically correct or not, or whether the ornaments are either elegant or well designed, there is always a purpose-like truthfulness about it which can never fail to be pleasing ; and thus, whatever its other defects may be, it must of necessity possess some of the most important elements of architectural excellence.

A further consequence of this truthfulness is, that we can reason with regard to buildings of the True Styles with the same certainty, and according to the same rules, which we apply when speaking of the works of Nature. Man's works, though immeasurably inferior in degree, are parts of the same great scheme ; and when they are produced by the simple exercise of man's reason, they are as distinctly natural as any of the instinctive functions which can be performed either by man or by any of the lower animals.

It follows from this that we contemplate the truthful products of man's action with the same pleasure which we experience in studying the works of nature, and derive from their contemplation the same class of gratification ; for, though they do not emanate from the same high intelligence, they are the results of the same process in so far as it is given to us to understand it : their form is the same, while they appeal more familiarly to our own feelings, and gratify even more directly our own desires.

The buildings in the Imitative Styles, being designed on a totally different principle, produce, as might be expected, a totally different class of results. It is, perhaps, not too much to say that no perfectly truthful architectural building has been erected in Europe since the Reformation. Mere utilitarian buildings are truthful of course, but the moment ornament comes to be applied, or an attempt is made, by any arrangement of the parts of a building, to obtain an architectural effect, the new element is inevitably introduced. In modern designs there is always an effort either to reproduce the style of some foreign country or that of some by-gone age ; frequently both. The form of the buildings is more or less moulded according to these foreign elements, while the ornamentation, being always borrowed, seldom expresses the construction, and scarcely ever the real truthful objects, to which the building is applied.



The first consequence of this is, that, unless we know the history of a building from some extraneous sources, we can never be sure, either from its form or from the style of its ornamentation, by whom it was erected. It may have belonged to the Greeks or to the Romans, or been erected by the Mediæval architects. The highest praise that can be bestowed on a modern building is, that its details are so perfectly copied from some other style as to produce a perfect counterfeit, such as would deceive any one, if its parts were considered separately from the locality or their position in the building. The plans and arrangements being also generally designed on the same system, we can rarely guess from its external appearance to what use it was intended any given building should be applied. It may be a church, a hall, a dwelling—anything, in short. Till within the last few years the object of a design was not that it should look like any of those things, but that it should resemble some building of some long anterior age, with which it may have no conceivable connexion, beyond the idea that the old building was beautiful, and that consequently it was desirable that it should be reproduced.

From this it is evident that, whatever the other merits of modern buildings may be, the element of truthfulness is altogether wanting. St. Peter's or St. Paul's are not Roman buildings, though affecting a classical style of ornamentation; and even the Walhalla or the Madeleine are only more servile copies, without attaining the impossible merit of being Greek or Roman temples. So, too, with our Gothic fashions. Our Parliament Houses are not mediæval, notwithstanding the beauty or correctness of their details; nor do any of our best modern churches attain to greater truthfulness or originality of design than exists in the Walhalla or buildings of that class. The consequence is, we can never look upon them with the same satisfaction as we do on buildings of the True Styles; and we never dare to draw conclusions from either their style or their forms as to the age in which they were built, or the purposes to which they may have been dedicated, nor can we ever feel sure that the construction we see is a necessary part of the design, and not put there because something like it was placed in a similar situation for some other purpose in some other age.

All this not only destroys one half the pleasure we experience in contemplating the buildings of a more truthful style, but it degrades architecture from its high position of a quasi-natural production to that of a mere imitative art. In this form it may be quite competent to gratify our tastes and feelings, but can never appeal to our higher intellectual faculties; and what ought to be the noblest and the grandest of the Fine Arts, sinks below the level of Painting and of Sculpture; for, though these last are naturally inferior, they retain at the present day much of that truthfulness which the other has lost,



and, though now generally ranked with them, in reality Architecture excites less interest than they do.

Besides this loss of intellectual value, the art has also, in modern times, lost all ethnographic signification. It may be asserted with confidence that, during the existence of the True Styles, there was not a single edifice erected in any country that pretended to be a reproduction of any building of a preceding age, nor one that was borrowed or adopted from any foreign country or people, or resembled their productions, except in so far as its builders were allied by blood, or possessed a community of feelings or interest with the people from whom they were borrowing. On the other hand, there is not perhaps a single building of any architectural pretension erected in Europe since the Reformation, in the beginning of the sixteenth century, which is not more or less a copy, either in form or detail, from some building either of a different clime or different age from those in which it was erected. There is no building, in fact, the design of which is not borrowed from some country or people with whom our only associations are those derived from education alone, wholly irrespective of either blood or feeling.

So completely is this the case, that few are aware that such a science exists as the Ethnography of Art, and that the same ever-shifting fashions have not always prevailed as those that now bewilder the architectural student in modern Europe.

It is evident that two forms of Art based on such diametrically opposite principles, and aiming at such different objects, must require a very different mode of criticism, and be judged of according to very different codes of æsthetic laws; but it does not follow that either is worthless, or that, because the one is certainly good, the other must be necessarily bad. It is true we can no longer from a few details of an "Order" restore the whole with the same certainty and by the same process which enables a naturalist from a few fragments of bone to rehabilitate the animal to which they once belonged. We can no longer, from the position of two or three bases, predict with certainty the form of a large edifice, and tell the purposes to which it was originally applied. We cannot, from the frustrum of a Gothic pier, tell the age when the building was erected, nor whether it bore a vaulted or a wooden roof, nor whether it was a part of a church or a hall, a palace or a castle.

All this is so strongly felt that, though numberless books have been written during the last fifty years<sup>1</sup> to illustrate the Classical and Mediæval styles, and most histories include, besides these, the

<sup>1</sup> In the last century the contrary was the case. Agincourt, Durand, De Quincey, and others pass over the Gothic styles as

barbarous and unworthy of any notice, and begin the history of Modern Art with Alberti, Brunelleschi, &c.

Egyptian, the Indian, the Chinese, and every True Style known, they all stop short about the year 1500, in so far at least as Europe is concerned. None venture across the forbidden boundary of the Reformation; so that both the Renaissance and the Revival want a historian in recent times. No one who is imbued with the spirit of the True Styles can be at a loss to understand why this should be so; though it is strange that those who enforce the practice, as is done in every country of Europe in modern times, should condemn the theory on which that method is based. Either it is wrong in us to persevere in copying, or, if we are justified in our present practice, we cannot be mistaken regarding the importance of a careful study of the steps by which we have arrived at its principles, and, by an impartial criticism, attempting to estimate their value. Even if it should be found difficult to do this with perfect fairness, it must always be interesting to the philosophical student to investigate the steps by which Art in Europe has reached its present position. More than this, it cannot possibly be uninteresting to study any important form of Art, as it has been practised during three centuries by the most powerful, the best educated, and—barring the little group of Grecian States—the most intellectual association of nations that the world has ever known. If the European nations have deliberately adopted any form of Art, it is fair to assume that there must be some reason for it; or if they have fallen into it from mere careless thoughtlessness, it must still be curious to know how this came about; and, if wrong, it is only by thoroughly knowing the form of disease that a remedy can be prescribed. The one point, however, that especially requires attention at this stage of the inquiry is to know that there are in reality two styles of Architectural Art—one practised universally before the sixteenth century, and another invented since then—and that the one must be judged of by a totally different canon of criticism from that applicable to the style which preceded it.

In order to understand what follows, it is so essential that this difference should be thoroughly appreciated, that it will be necessary, before going further, to point out, as distinctly as possible, how these differences arose—in what they really consist—and by what new rules or standards they must be measured.

## II.—REVIVAL OF CLASSICAL LITERATURE.

The most remarkable proximate cause of the change that took place in Architectural Art is one that has long been obvious to every inquirer. It arose from the revival of classical literature in Western Europe about the middle of the fifteenth century. Throughout the whole of the Middle Ages the great bulk of the clergy could read



Latin with facility, and so could many of the laity ; but so complete had been the night of the Dark Ages, that, though they understood the words, the sentiments of the classical authors found as little sympathy in the hearts of their readers as an episode of the *Ramayana* or *Mahabharata* does in that of a modern novel-reader. Even Dante reads Virgil through a Christian gloss, and, though familiar with his works in the original, he does not see the poetic Roman, so much as the metaphysical schoolman, in his glowing pages. It was not till the age immediately preceding the fall of Constantinople that the existence of the great literature of Greece became known in Western Europe ; but when Petrarch and Boccaccio first became acquainted with its beauties, they naturally lauded their discovery to the skies, and incited those who could not read Homer and Demosthenes in the original Greek to study their echoes in Virgil and Cicero. Once it became the fashion, and men had got over the unfamiliar names and allusions, it was hailed with all the enthusiasm of a new discovery, and became the literature of the day. Had the Middle Ages possessed any literature of their own, this would not have been the case, to the same extent at least. But neither in poetry nor in prose—in science nor in literature—had the Dark Ages produced anything that could for one moment stand a comparison with the glorious literary productions of Greek and Roman civilisation. We cannot, consequently, wonder at the enthusiasm which the discovery of these long-hidden treasures excited, though we may regret the too hasty generalisation that applied to every class of Art the induction which was only strictly applicable to one.

It must also be borne in mind that the revolution in Architectural Art took its rise first in Italy, and especially at Rome ; which was then the spiritual, as it had once been the imperial, capital of Europe. To the Italians it was not the discovery of a strange or foreign art ; their language was almost that of the ancient conquerors of the world ; their country was the same ; the revival was hailed as a burst of patriotism, claiming for their ancestors the glory of having enlightened, as it was admitted they had ruled, the world, and priest and layman joined heart and hand in asserting the indefeasible right of Rome to be considered as the mistress of the world in all ages. Deeply as we are imbued by education with admiration for classical literature, we can hardly appreciate the enthusiasm which swelled the breast of the modern Roman on discovering in the pages of Livy the great and glorious events which had been enacted within the walls of his own native city, or the feelings with which he read, in the Books of Tacitus, the gorgeous but gloomy pictures of imperial greatness which have immortalised the Palace of the Cæsars, whose remains still stood before his eyes. He could read Cicero on the very spot where his Orations were delivered, and look down from the Capitol on that Forum which had

given laws to the world, and over that city which had been before, and was then, the greatest and most illustrious of the universe. In so far as architecture was concerned, the Roman had daily before his eyes the Pantheon and the Temple of Peace, the gorgeous remains of the imperial *Thermæ* and of the Palace of the *Cæsars*; the porticoes of innumerable Temples were then standing, and the Flavian Amphitheatre, more perfect than than now, was known as the greatest architectural wonder of the world.

Compared with these, the great Basilicas of St. Peter and St. Paul were externally rude and mean in the last degree, and internally almost all the beauty they possessed was derived from the ranges of columns separating the aisles, which were borrowed from the buildings of their ancestors. The wonder is, not that the Romans discarded at once what little of Mediævalism they ever had adopted, but that they had ever neglected or had fallen away from the great classical models which met their eyes at every turn.

From Rome the contagion spread rapidly to the rest of Italy. There was not a city in the peninsula which was not hallowed by some memory of Roman greatness, not one that was not even then adorned by some monument that called back the memories of the past, and reminded the citizens how beautiful the arts of the classical age had been. The patriotism which is now stirring the depths of the Italian mind is but a faint reflex of that enthusiasm with which Italy in the fifteenth century reclaimed the inheritance of the *Cæsars*; and, in addition to the ecclesiastical supremacy of the world, which was then the undisputed prerogative of her great capital, she claimed for her language and her arts their pre-eminence over those of all other nations. Then, as of late, she strove to drive back the barbarous *Tedeschi*, who had meddled so fatally in her affairs; and, if she could, she would have obliterated every trace of their hated influence. If the past could not be washed out, the future at least was her own; and Roman literature, Roman art, and Roman memories were thenceforward the watchwords of the Italians.

From Italy the revival soon spread to France: partly in consequence of the direct interference of Francis I. with Italian affairs, but more certainly from the influence of the clergy, who all emanated more or less directly from Rome, or either visited it or looked to it as their leader and model in all things. Spain too was ripe for a change. The expulsion of the hated Moors from Granada, the discovery of the New World, and the enormous accession of wealth and influence which resulted from these causes, led the Spaniards to condemn the arts and literature of a divided and struggling people; their religious feelings threw them blindly into the arms of Rome, and they adopted her arts with the same enthusiasm with which they venerated her religion.



In England the progress of the revolution was far slower. A change took place in the age of Elizabeth, but scarcely in the direction of Roman art. Even the pedant James could hardly obtain a classical design, and it remained for the foreign feelings and refined tastes of Charles I. to fix fairly upon us the copying principles which had long before that time taken root on the Continent.

The Germans early abandoned an art they had never really appreciated, and, with pedantic affectation, set about the study of the classic. Their industry took, however, a literary more than an artistic form, and thus their architectural efforts during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are poor and contemptible in the extreme. The revolution had, however, fairly taken root in Europe; by degrees it spread to Scandinavia, and even into Russia, and now has occupied the New World with strange deformities, and is spreading into India and every country of the world. China and some of the less civilised Trans-Gangetic countries are still free from the contagion, but it is by no means clear how long they are to retain their immunity.

[THE MODERN EUROPEAN STYLE :—How is it possible, in the eyes of men of scientific culture, that such a revolution in European intellect as that which took place in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, should fail to develop a corresponding revolution in art? And how is it possible that this should be developed otherwise than “naturally” by the inevitable operation of natural law? How can the miracle of artificiality be even for once achievable in so vast a movement? And how is it possible that in our own subject of Architecture—very aptly designated History in Stone—the new development should be in any way otherwise than the direct and coincident consequence of the conditions of the renovated world, the absolutely equivalent effect of that definite or indefinite cause? To say that such a new period of History should not produce its own new style of Architecture, is to suggest a scientific absurdity; and even to say that this could be unworthy of the name of a style, is only a play upon words.

The style of design, therefore, which arose in Italy in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, whatever may be its demerits, was the natural style of the New Europe, of which the Italy of that period was the exultant mother. If it was an Italian style, it was not for Italy alone, but for all the modern (or Italian) world—for all westward lands, in turn, as the empire of Italian culture should hold its westward way. As for demerits, these, alike with its merits, could not possibly be other than characteristic effects of the causes in operation. If architects were reverting to old Rome, was it not because all artists, and all men of learning, were reverting to old Rome? Modern Europe could not in the circumstances avoid taking up the clue of civilisation where Ancient Europe had dropped it—at Rome. Centuries a good many had intervened; vicissitudes a good many had trampled upon it; but there

it was for the taking up again ; and it was taken up again. What better could have been done ? What else could have been done ?

But what of the "sham ?" The answer is that there was no sham in the initial principle. The execrable shams of Modern Architecture came out of that principle, we may admit ; but it was in their own way. And what of the "copyism ?" It is quite a mistake to say that the Italian Revivalists merely proceeded to copy the Roman temples. The temples were not at all the point at which the ancients relinquished their process of development ; nor were they the point at which the moderns took up theirs. It was in such examples as the Flavian Amphitheatre that the Antique terminated ; and it was with precisely similar designs that the Revival resumed. Granted the æsthetic short-comings of those old examples—the confusion, for instance, of large-stone forms with small-stone construction ; is it not all the more significant when the student of development finds that the new examples at once accepted that very practice as it stood ? They proved themselves to be in a natural position by their very error. But why did they accept, for instance, this particular idea ? The rejoinder is ; Why had the ancients accepted it ? There can be only one answer. The conditions of the ancients in Italy, and the conditions of the moderns in Italy, were so far alike, that what was done by the one was done for the other ; and how far it was in merit or in demerit does not matter.

The actual Roman manner which was thus revived was the application of the colonnade and the arcade, in superimposed ranges where necessary, and chiefly in the way of superficialisation or surface-art on a wall. The "copying" was the acceptance of the best antique details, because they certainly were, as they still are, not to be easily improved upon. The "authority of antiquity," as an academical formula, naturally followed. But the whole of this scheme of "imitation," so far as it was a counterfeit—or a "sham," if the phrase must nowadays be accepted—could only be so called on much more philosophical grounds than have ever been the rule in practical æsthetics. Superficialisation on the same principle, and even less intelligently handled, was common everywhere in Europe during the entire era of the Middle Ages : it is to be found also in all earlier work throughout the world ; the higher criticism must admit that even the entablature of the most severe form of the Greek temple is a case in point.

The radical elements, then, of the Neo-Classie, Italian, or Modern European style of architecture are these :—first, the wall-colonnade, or "attached order," as distinguished from the open colonnade or portico, which was the basis of the Greek ; and secondly, the arcade, which was the basis of the later Roman and of all the mediæval modes. Observe, for example, the generality of the illustrations throughout Book I., referring to the actual works of the Renaissance on Italian soil. How, then, were the cinquecentists to superficialise these features ? Of course, it is easy for



us to say, offhand nowadays, that the attached colonnades and arcades of the Flavian Amphitheatre and other contemporaneous examples were false art ; but more scientific criticism is not so hasty in its conclusions, and there are two considerations which it will not overlook. If, in the first place, this ambitious treatment of a wall surface can be kept within the limits of actual acceptable construction, and if, secondly, that actual construction can be achieved without doing violence to its own principles, what becomes of the false art then ? Surely it is idle to demand in wall-work a theoretical perfection of absolutely uncompromised structural design ; for this would compel us to be satisfied with mere fenestration so meagre and archaic, and confined within such a very narrow range of variety, that architecture as a fine-art would cease to exist. It has been discovered long ago in all things human, that advantage must be paid for ; and it is a mere mathematical truism, therefore, that building-work, having *per se* no essential grace, must be permitted to be endowed with grace at the price of a compromise. All that can be reasonably contended for is that this price shall be the smallest, and payable in the most convenient coin.—Ed.]

### III.—REFORMATION IN RELIGION.

The great change just alluded to was wrought in Europe simultaneously with the Reformation in religious matters, not as a separate thing, but, in fact, as a part of the same great awakening of the human intellect. The invention of gunpowder, and the consolidation of the larger empires, had necessitated wars being carried on on a greater scale than heretofore, and so mixed the nations more together, and gave them larger and more correct ideas of the relative positions and power of each ; while the invention of printing had aided in the diffusion of knowledge to an extent previously unknown in the history of the world. These, and other causes which it is not necessary to enumerate here, led to the secession of all the Teutonic races of Europe from the Church of Rome, and to that consequent excitement and spirit of inquiry which characterised the great Reformation in spiritual matters. With us it gave rise to that freedom of thought and action to which we owe so much, but accompanied by a contempt for all things Mediæval and a hatred of everything that savoured of Romish feeling or domination. From all these causes the Reformed nations were led to repudiate whatever belonged to Christian Rome, while they blindly adopted whatever had belonged to its Pagan predecessor.

Even in those countries to which the Reformation did not extend, a revolution took place scarcely less extensive or important. Though acknowledging the supremacy of the Pope, and adhering nominally to the same forms, the essence of the Roman Catholic religion was no longer in the sixteenth what it had been in the thirteenth century.

The enlarged views which the revival of classical literature and art had introduced, the progress of science, and the general enlightenment of mankind, worked a silent reformation, almost as extensive as that violent one to which alone the name is usually applied; and if the countries which remained Papal did not learn to hate, they at least learned to despise the works of their forefathers. They saw the most beautiful Gothic churches fall to decay with as little regret as if they had been followers of Knox or Calvin, or they beautified them with classical details with as much self-satisfaction as could have been felt by the most orthodox churchwardens of the Georgian era.

One of the first consequences of this revolution in ecclesiastical affairs was the almost total cessation of church-building throughout Europe. Those countries especially which had thrown off the Papal yoke and dissolved their monasteries, found themselves overstocked with ecclesiastical edifices, and even France had so far changed in feeling that the buildings she already possessed more than sufficed for her wants; and, except from the increasing magnitude and influence of the capital, she probably would hardly have erected a single important church during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

In Spain the case was slightly different. The enormous influx of wealth in the sixteenth century, consequent on her connexion with the Indies, led her to spend a large proportion of it in a manner so congenial to the strong religious feelings of the country; and we find, in consequence, in Spain, a considerable number of churches in the Revived Classical style which are deserving of attention from their size and richness, if not for their Art.

In Italy, however, church-building retained its previous pre-eminence. The end of the fifteenth and beginning of the sixteenth centuries were the culminating epoch of the Papal power and wealth, and saw in consequence in the commencement of St. Peter's the most daring and the most magnificent undertaking of its class in Europe, or perhaps it may be said in the world. St. Peter's was far from being a solitary example, for throughout all Italy numberless new churches were commenced and old ones altered and restored; Rome itself, as well as Venice, Genoa, Florence, and Milan, are enriched with churches of the sixteenth century which vie in splendour with the works of the Middle Ages, whatever may be said of their taste; and the Jesuits carried their peculiar style into every country to which they had access, and practised it with that exuberance of richness in ornamentation which characterises their churches everywhere.

From these causes it will be easy to understand that Italy became the leader in the revolution, and not only set the example to other nations, but actually forced on the world the adoption of the Classical style of Church Architecture which had sprung up among the classical remains of ancient Rome. This new style was moulded by the genius



of those great artists who attached themselves to the Papal Court at that period into a new shape, and was by their influence fixed, for a time at least, on the attention of Europe.

Although the countries on this side the Alps abandoned almost entirely the practice of Ecclesiastical Architecture, they made up for it, in extent at least, by the erection of civil and domestic buildings, on a scale hitherto unknown. It is quite curious to observe in the works of the period how completely the change had taken place in men's minds. The great work of Du Cerceau, for instance, published in 1576, contains illustrations of thirty of "*les plus excellens bastimens de la France*," but he does not include one single church in his collection. In Mariette's famous folio work there are plans and details of one hundred palaces and civil buildings, but only very imperfect notices of eight Parisian churches; and the six folio volumes of our own '*Vitruvius Britannicus*' contain short notices of only three churches, but have full and complete details of one hundred and seventy-five civil edifices. It may also be added that but for the accident of the Fire of London in 1666, which necessitated the rebuilding of the City churches, we should hardly possess any examples from which we could learn what the Ecclesiastical Architecture of this country really pretended to be during the last two centuries.

This supremacy of Domestic over Ecclesiastical Architecture was nearly fatal for the latter. However grand or magnificent a palace may be, it must possess domestic offices and apartments for servants, which no art can hide and no taste can dignify. The architects of the Renaissance tried to divert attention from these by placarding their buildings with the porticoes and details of the Templar Architecture of the Romans, but they merely succeeded in adding incongruity to the inherent defects of the subject, and degraded the borrowed features, which were beautiful in themselves, without elevating the building whose deficiencies they thought they might thus be able to conceal.

It was by no means necessary that this should be done. The temple and the palace are in themselves so essentially different, that, by treating each according to its kind, all interference is easily avoided. Nevertheless, during the last two centuries, when civil buildings occupied almost exclusively the attention of every architect and absorbed nine-tenths of the funds allotted to building purposes, it was almost impossible that the church should escape the influence of the Domestic style. In fact, Ecclesiastical Architecture became Domestic without having the power or influence to react on the palatial style, and neither was in consequence able to elevate itself, or to shake off the trammels of the imitative system into which they both had sunk.

Another circumstance very detrimental to real architectural progress arose from the fact that the Christian ritual is essentially an internal form of worship, and makes no use whatever of the exterior

of its churches in the performance of its services : a circumstance not in itself involving any difficulty, as an interior may be made as fine as an exterior, when honestly treated ; but it became a source of numerous incongruities when the details of an external style came to be applied to internal purposes. It is well known how cleverly and how well the Gothic architects got over this difficulty, but at Constantinople, and more especially at Rome and Ravenna, the exteriors of the early churches were entirely devoid of ornament, apparently on purpose to distinguish them from Pagan temples. The consequence was, that, when the Italian Architects were called upon to make the exterior of their churches as ornamental as the Gothic architects had done, they, having no style of their own, could think of nothing better than to suggest a Pagan peristyle. From its uselessness they dared not go further than a portico, and that generally of semi-detached columns, but for the flanks they were content with the employment of pilasters, which, it must be confessed, is one of the most useless as well as least constructive modes of ornamentation that could be adopted. This, added to the other difficulties enumerated above, gave a character of unreality to the style, and betrayed that continual striving after imitative forms which is its bane and fatal to anything like truthfulness of effect.

It is not necessary at the present stage of this inquiry to attempt to assign its relative importance to each of these separate elements of design. All that is here required is to point out the difference between an imitative and a true style. In the latter the architect had only to consider, first, how he could contrive the most convenient and appropriate building ; secondly, how he could arrange this so as to be most ornamental with the least possible sacrifice of convenience ; and, thirdly, how he could accentuate and ornament his construction so as to make it most obvious and most elegant. These three propositions contain in themselves all the elements of design, and ought never for one moment to be absent from the mind of the architect.

In modern times he has, in addition, and too generally in substitution for these, to try and make the building look like something it is not and cannot be, and has to apply a system of ornamentation which is generally inappropriate and almost always useless. This practice arose out of the enthusiasm created by the rediscovery of an earlier Art, and has been continued because the true Art of architecture perished under the influence of the false system then introduced, and, in this art at least, no living forms being available to which we can resort, we are still compelled to cling for models to the past.

[IMITATION AND COUNTERFEIT IN MODERN ARCHITECTURE :—Is it really the fact that modern architecture, as the author seems to suggest, is all a sham ? If it was so, or desirable to be called so, when seen in the light in which he formed his opinions at the period at which he



was writing, is it still so, or still so desirable, in the light in which we must now make his doctrines useful, whether to the earnest professional student or to the interested general reader—both of whom ought to be encouraged to take a liberal, not an illiberal, view of a recondite art, if they are to find intelligent pleasure in its contemplation, and not needless dissatisfaction? Do we not still hear too much of the “utter debasement,” and what not, of all modern art, and especially of all art in England? Is it not mere common sense to suggest that, if this be only an impulsive generalisation, an affectation of self-denial, or a dogma pardonably exaggerated to make it piquant (true philosophy—science—is never piquant), then such a doctrine, however impressive it may be, or however salutary in some circumstances, is but a fallacy, and almost a vulgar fallacy. If even there should be only a reservation to make, is it not on the face of the matter a hazardous thing to ignore it, to disguise it, to compromise it? When we have strong doctrine, therefore, we must not forget the reservations.

At the time of “the Revival of Arts and Letters”—so it has been argued amongst us a thousand times—a movement having in it something of the nature of an arbitrary act of academical choice was originated in Italy, and eventually carried over Europe at large, whereby architecture, instead of being allowed to take a course of its own, was forced into a style founded upon the acceptance of antique models for direct imitation. The adherents of this system (it is added) call it in admiration “the Renaissance;” the artistic mode of the ancient Romans was born again. But why (they go on to say) should this have been brought about? To make the style of the Roman Empire by a stroke of the pencil the style of Modern Europe was a sham, was it not? And if it has proved the fertile source of shams innumerable, what else could we reasonably expect? So runs the argument.

It cannot be denied that the features of the ancient Roman architecture were faithfully copied at the period in question, and that the whole of Europe gradually accepted the rule. If so, it surely follows that the Modern European style of that day—if worthy of the name of a style—would be this system; but is it worthy of the name of a style? Various classes of debaters say it is not.

Again, if the mind of modern Europe were thus artificially perverted from the course which natural development would have dictated, this question can scarcely be avoided:—What would that course have been? This inquiry has seldom been instituted with proper scientific intent; and it certainly has never been answered with any scientific precision. We have been told in one way or another frequently that the architects of this or that individual nation could, and, if left to themselves, presumably would, have found a style natural to the soil by the simple expedient of reverting to the mode which had prevailed with their predecessors; and it is suggested that they must have been allowed,

of course, to "select" that particular "period" which would in their opinion be the most meritorious or the most suitable. But the scientific or logical objections to this conclusion are obvious. To speak of selection in whatever sense is instantly fatal to the argument; for it can only signify a direct interference with the virtue of that process of natural development which it is the very object of the argument to preserve in its integrity. The suggestion of it is at the best but the substitution of another artificiality for the one that is condemned; it puts aside a revival here for the purpose of taking up a revival there. The only question that could be at all scientifically asked would be—why the local architects of the days of Renaissance could not in each case have accepted without discrimination the mediæval modes or "periods" of their own country *en bloc*, allowing the fittest to survive of itself; but the answer manifestly is that even this measure of "selection" would not be consistent with the laws of natural development. Then what was really the condition of European architecture at the great crisis we are dealing with? Surely this—that the whole ecclesiastical system of the Middle Ages had gone to decay, and its architecture with the rest. Like all other things, it had had its bright morning long ago, its robust midday, its siesta-time of ease, indolence, luxury, and enervation; and now eventide had come with weakness and weariness. To suppose, as many seem to do, that the classic revival supplanted everywhere, or anywhere, even a semi-vigorous condition of mediæval art, is quite at variance with the facts of the case. To suppose that exotic influences fought and conquered native influences is equally wrong. The enemies of the great Church were in its own household; the revival of antique taste, with antique learning, was the act of learned and accomplished men in the monasteries, not of agitators in the streets. The manuscripts of Vitruvius, amongst the others, were not picked up at the bookstalls, but taken from the shelves of the convent libraries; not published in the market place, but studied in the cloister. None knew better than great churchmen of that day, that the scheme of European society must pass inevitably into a new form—that it was their own fate to be born in the winter, from which, however, other but not better men would see a springtime arise.—ED.]

#### IV.—PAINTING AND SCULPTURE.

The extraordinary development of the Italian School of Painting in the course of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries was another circumstance which had almost as much influence on the form which the Renaissance style of Architecture took, as the revival of classical literature, or any other of the circumstances pointed out above.

It is scarcely necessary to do more here than allude to that wonder-



ful School of Art which first took consistence under Cimabue<sup>1</sup> and Giotto<sup>2</sup> in the thirteenth century, almost contemporaneously with the perfect development of the Pointed style in Northern Europe, and progressing steadily and earnestly *pari passu*, reached its culminating point about the year 1500 in that galaxy of great Painters with whose names the public are so familiar.

To the Italians in those ages Painting always was the art *par excellence*, and they cultivated it with the same earnestness and assiduity which distinguished the cis-Alpine nations in elaborating their beautiful style of architecture. In our buildings Painting was always kept in strict subordination to structural necessities : with the Italians the structure was generally considered as less important, and never thought to be complete or perfect till the Painter had covered every available space with the productions of his art. Even in so essentially Tedesco a building as the Church of San Francesco at Assisi, the paintings are thought, not only by the Italians, but by most modern critics, as more admirable than the very beautiful Pointed Architecture of the church itself. While this is not the case with any known church on this side of the Alps.

One of the most complete and perfect examples, showing how pre-eminent Painting was considered by the Italians, is the Chapel of the Arena at Padua, painted by Giotto. The nave is merely a small rectangular apartment, covered by a simple Pointed waggon-vault, absolutely without a single architectural moulding of any sort, and pierced with a range of narrow Pointed windows on one side only ; the object of the whole arrangement being to afford the greatest possible amount of plain surface for Painting. If they could have lighted it from the roof it is evident they would have done so ; but the art of glazing was not then sufficiently advanced to admit of this.

On the left hand as you enter, the whole wall is divided into rectangular compartments separated by painted architectural borders, and in each is a Scripture subject, painted in fresco. On the right hand the same mode of treatment is followed, but interrupted by the windows, and less perfectly seen, because of their light interfering. Over the doorway is represented the Last Judgment, and opposite this is a small octagonal apse with architectural mouldings, but also richly painted.

The effect of the whole is so pleasing that a candid critic will hesitate before asserting that this little inexpensive cell will not stand a fair comparison with the glories of such buildings as the contemporary Sainte Chapelle at Paris, or even St. Stephen's at Westminster. Wonderful as these were as works of Art, there is a purity and simplicity and a loftiness of aim about this little chapel which go far to rival their splendour ; and it is questionable whether in this direction some-

<sup>1</sup> Born 1240 ; died 1300.

<sup>2</sup> Born 1276 ; died 1336.

thing even loftier and grander might not have been attained. Practically, perhaps, the real objection to the dependence of Architecture on Painting alone, lies in the fact that we cannot always command Giotto's ; while we can be always sure of obtaining master-builders ; but more than this, it is evident that the effect of even Giotto's frescoes would have been heightened by architectural mouldings being interspersed with them. As usual, the truth is, that perfection lies between the two extremes. The Italians of that age despised architecture as an internal decoration far too much. We, on the contrary, neglected painting, in order to display our mechanical skill ; and the consequence is, that, though we produced miracles of masonry, our buildings want at times just that touch of higher Art which would render them sublime.

This distinction between the Italian and Northern styles lies so completely at the root of the whole subject, that it may be well, before proceeding further, to advert to another more celebrated example, the Sistine Chapel (Woodcut No. 1), which is not only decorated in the same manner as the Arena Chapel, but, from the accident of the time when it was erected, and the fame of those employed on it, exercised immense influence on the future development of the Art.

By comparing it with the contemporary chapel at King's College, Cambridge (Woodcut No. 2), we may perhaps arrive at some clear idea of the distinctive modes of ornamenting interiors on the two sides of the Alps.

The Roman chapel was commenced for Pope Sixtus IV. by Baccio Pintelli in 1473 ; the painting of the roof was completed by Michael Angelo in 1508, and the Last Judgment in 1541. Externally the chapel is as devoid of ornament as a barn. Internally it is an oblong hall, less than 50 feet in width and 140 feet in length. The walls are nearly plain to a height equal to the width of the chapel, where a coved ceiling in plaster of very ordinary design springs from a string course which is cut through by the round heads of the windows—six on each side, and originally two at each end. Above this string course all the architectural mouldings are merely painted on the flat surface of the roof, and consequently generally appear in false perspective. Below the bottom of these windows another string course supports a slight pilaster, to carry the pilasters from which the arches of the cove spring, and a third lower down separates the whole wall into three nearly equal belts. The lowest of these, within the sanctuary, which occupies two-thirds of the whole length of the chapel, was to be adorned with the tapestries for which Raphael made the cartoons now at South Kensington. The next, or principal belt, was adorned, on the left-hand of the altar, by types from the old Testament by Signorelli, Roselli, and others, and on the right-hand by their antitypes from the New Testament, by Perugino, Botticelli, Ghirlandajo, and others. The Ascension of the Virgin was over the altar ; the Nativity, and its type the Finding of Moses, on either hand.



The third belt was occupied by the windows, with the figures between, and over this came the famous ceiling painted by Michael Angelo ; the cove occupied by Sybils and Prophets, and the well-known groups which fill up and enrich the whole ; the flat part of the ceiling by subjects beginning with the Creation at the end next the altar, and ending with the Deluge at the end next the entrance. The original design of the lower part of the chapel was afterwards altered by Michael Angelo, who obliterated the two windows over the altar, and the compartments which occupied that end, and filled the whole with his great masterpiece, the Last Judgment.

Although King's College was founded by Henry VI. in 1441, the building of the Chapel was not seriously undertaken till 1479, and was not completed in all essentials till 1530. It is a little less in width than the Sistine Chapel being only 45 feet wide ; but it is twice as long, being 290 feet internally, and divided into twelve bays instead of six. It is also higher, being 78 feet to the apex of the roof instead of 60. Throughout, from floor to keystone, its decorations are as essentially masonic as those of the Sistine are pictorial ; the paintings at Cambridge being as subordinate to the architecture as that is subordinate to the pictures at Rome. In both the subjects are the same, and similarly arranged ; the types from the Old Testament being arranged in the windows on one side of the chapel, and the subjects from the New Testament opposite to them on the other ; but at Cambridge they are all on glass, and filled in between the architectural mullions of the windows, so that no moulding or constructive feature is broken or interfered with by the paintings, but, on the contrary, the pictures are cut up and sometimes very seriously interfered with by the architecture.

Waiving for the present all criticism on the merit of the paintings which adorn the Sistine Chapel, and assuming only that they were carried out as originally designed by the artists who painted the pictures on the wall, and waiving also all question as to whether King's College Chapel is or is not a good specimen of Gothic Art, the comparison of the two buildings fairly raises the question between the two styles, in so far at least as interiors are concerned.

Is it better that a building should be ornamented from floor to ceiling with paintings appropriate to its destination, or that it should depend on constructive and architectural details only for its ornamentation ? Is it expedient to apply the resources of the highest of the æsthetic plastic arts to this purpose, or to depend only on an æsthetic form of the technic art of architecture to accomplish this object ?

Theoretically, it is easy to answer that the first is the highest, and consequently the best ; and if the Italians had fairly carried out what they so successfully commenced, it is tolerably clear that the question

would never have been afterwards ruised, and that painting, and that alone, would have been applied as the highest class of internal decoration. The introduction, however, of inappropriate classical architecture into their interiors, and the abandonment in a great measure of



Sistine Chapel, Rome.

the principles on which the Arena and the Sistine Chapels were designed, has so vitiated the question that it is not so easy to decide it now. In the meanwhile it will probably be admitted that a wall divided into compartments, and adorned with paintings designed for



the place they occupy, is a higher class of ornamentation than can be obtained by any mere structural form. The cove of the Sistine Chapel is also very beautifully and very appropriately ornamented ; but the flat part of the ceiling is certainly a mistake. It depends



2.

King's College Chapel, Cambridge.

on your position, standing at the altar or at the entrance, whether you see the figures upside down or not. It is always irksome and unpleasant to look up at figures immediately above you, and it is impossible to get rid of the feeling that they may or should tumble

out of their places. It is, besides, an offence against construction. If a wall is sufficiently thick, and is perpendicular, the eye requires no suggestion of construction to be satisfied of its stability ; but with a roof it is different. If of stone, the most elaborate contrivances must be resorted to to satisfy the mind of its stability ; if of wood, the framing ought to be shown ; and if of any other material, coffering or panelling, or some other expedient, must be employed to suggest to the mind that the inherent difficulty of the construction of a horizontal covering has been successfully accomplished. There are, consequently, a thousand ways by which it can be enriched or ornamented either with colour or mouldings, but it may safely be asserted that it should never be by figure-painting. So thoroughly imbued, however, were the Italians with the idea that figure-painting, and that only, was the appropriate way of ornamenting interiors, that they set a fashion which was followed in every palace and almost every church of Europe for the following two or three centuries. Every one can call to mind the sprawling gods and goddesses or saints and angels who cover the ceilings of the palaces and churches of that style. It was a mistake when so used, and in fact it was the abuse, not the use, of painting, coupled with the abuse of classical orders, which prevented the interiors of the Renaissance churches from rivalling those of the Gothic age.

Almost all these defects were avoided in the Arena Chapel, and might easily have been obviated in any building specially designed to be decorated by paintings. The circumstance which really rendered the system a comparative failure was the simultaneous introduction of the classical orders as interior decorations. These cut the building up in such a manner as to destroy all unity of effect, and left the painter to fit his designs into such spaces as the architect left him. It also rendered the latter supreme in carrying out a design which was neither meant to exhibit ornamental construction, like the Cambridge example, nor to afford unlimited scope for the art of the painter, like the Arena Chapel, nor even to combine the two, like the Sistine ; the object being to produce a classical interior which might to some extent represent construction, but which if adorned with painting must be so in due subordination to the classical details.

The treatment that such a building as the Sistine Chapel ought to have received externally is obvious enough. It ought to have been plain ashlar masonry, perhaps slightly accentuated at the angles, up to the string course at the bottom of the windows. These ought to have been enriched with appropriate mouldings and ornaments, and over them there should have been a cornicione of sufficient projection and richness, which would have completed an appropriate and beautiful whole ; suggesting the interior and the purpose for which it was used.

Any architect who knew his business would have felt the enormous



advantage of getting rid of buttresses and supports of all sorts, and, having no constructive difficulties to contend with, he ought easily to have surpassed the complicated construction of the Middle Ages, where beauty is always obliged to bend to mechanical necessities. This was not, unfortunately, the way the Italian architects looked at it. They were bitten with a mania for classicality, and, with the Amphitheatre and the Temples before their eyes, thought it indispensable to beauty that every building should be covered with a network of pilasters and arcades, and hooped with cornices one over another, in defiance, generally speaking, of either architectural beauty or constructive necessities.

If it had happened that the Italians had developed Sculpture on the same truthful principles and with the same energy which they applied to Painting, the history of Architectural Art might have been very different from what it has been. There is no argument which applies to the use of Painting internally which does not apply with equal force to the employment of the sister art externally. The two are, in fact, when properly applied, the highest and most legitimate modes of ornamenting buildings. But this is only the case when they adhere strictly to their own principles, and are each carried out in their own appropriate forms. The two may be, and ought always to be, linked together by the intermediate art of Architectural carving. But neither of the two principal arts ought ever to be allowed to interfere with the province of the other, or to transgress on that of the third, or harmonizing art, which is in itself for Architectural purposes scarcely less important than the others. While plaster, with which the internal walls must always be more or less covered, affords the best possible surface for painting, sculpture may and generally should be executed in the same materials of which the wall is composed to which it is applied. It is so easy to provide panels for groups, either in high or low relief, and belts for friezes or niches for single statues. All this might have been adopted by the Italian architects, and, without violating one single principle of construction, might have rendered the exterior of their buildings as phonetic as the interior, and given life and meaning to the whole. Unfortunately the mania for the "Orders" left no place for statues, except as acroteria above the roof; but there they were as inappropriate and as unhappy as the figures painted on the ceilings were on the inside. Before the "Orders" became an absolute fixed quantity, the Cinque-cento architects very nearly hit on the right path. They felt that painting was not applicable to the exterior of edifices, and in consequence proposed to reproduce in stone on the exterior of their buildings the arabesque or other decorative designs which had been found painted in the baths of Titus, and which Raphael and others have so successfully imitated in the loggie of the Vatican and elsewhere (Woodcut No. 3). This taste

did not last long, for it was soon discovered that what was elegant and appropriate when sketched in colours for an interior, became an expensive monstrosity when deliberately carved in stone and set up as part of a gigantic façade. It was, besides, an attempt to use in one art the designs only appropriate for another. It failed in consequence, and from its failure the architects fell back on the easy but most inartistic subterfuge of copying the classical orders, to hide their own sad want of appreciation of the true conditions of the problem they had undertaken to solve.



3. Fragment from the Pellegrini Chapel, Verona.

Any one who casts his eye over the wonderful façade of the Certosa at Pavia,<sup>1</sup> or of the Spanish and French churches of the same age, is lost in wonder at the amount of labour bestowed upon them. He may be fascinated by the beauty of their details, but he cannot but feel that, considering the labour involved, their real effect is less than that produced by any other style of decoration. It was, in fact, applying to an exterior what really belonged to internal art, and to a hard and durable material a style appropriate only to the fanciful sketchiness permissible with more perishable materials.

The failure of this attempt led to a most unfortunate reaction in the opposite direction. Finding that this style of internal decoration failed to produce the desired effect when applied externally, and not perceiving that the failure was in the mode of doing it, and not in the thing itself, the architects of the day crowded the interiors of their churches and palaces with the great Orders which the Romans designed and destined chiefly for external decoration; they thus produced not only most offensive inappropriateness, but dwarfed their buildings and cramped their designs to an extent which will be only too often apparent in the sequel.

#### V.—TECHNIC AND PHONETIC FORMS OF ART.

The differences pointed out above between the modes in which the art of Architecture was practised before the Reformation and after that event, are sufficient to account for all the formal changes that then took place, and to explain the influences which gave rise to the external variations of style between the two epochs; and they have

<sup>1</sup> See Woodcut No. 22.



also the advantage of being intelligible to the most superficial observer. But the real and essential change lies deeper, and cannot be properly explained without reviewing the whole philosophy of the arts in a manner which would be entirely out of place in the Introduction to such a work as this. It is, however, so important, that a brief statement of the principal points is indispensable before proceeding further.<sup>1</sup>

All the arts practised by man may be divided into two great classes—the Technic Arts and the Phonetic Arts. To the first group belong all those which are concerned with the production of food, clothing, and shelter for man, and generally all the useful arts. In the other class are grouped all those arts which arise out of the special gift of speech, which man enjoys alone of all living beings. It comprises Poetry, Painting, Sculpture, and, in short all those arts which minister to the intellectual wants of mankind, as the Technic arts were invented to supply his physical necessities.

Of course it is impossible to draw a line sharply between the two groups, so as accurately to define their limits, and the one continually overlaps the other in a manner to prevent any compendious system of classification that can be stated in a few words. For present purposes this is of little consequence, as all that is wanted here is to point out the different modes in which perfection is attained in either class.

The process by which progress is achieved in the useful arts is very much the same as that by which investigations are conducted in the sciences. In the latter, after they have passed their infancy, the individual is nothing, the age everything. If a giant does occasionally appear, he only makes a rapid step in advance, which would be accomplished as certainly, though perhaps more slowly, by ten dwarfs. It is bit by bit, hour by hour, year by year, that our agriculture has been converted from the rude processes of our forefathers to the high farming of the present day, that the galley of the Edwards has been developed into the *Agincourt* or the *Great Eastern*, or that the narrow spans of the mediæval bridges have been superseded by the spacious arches of London Bridge or the fairy framework that spans the Tamar.

Few know, and fewer care to learn, who were the men who invented all the multifarious processes of modern agriculture. No one, if he tried, could find out who improved our ships; and even now, though the attention of all the world has been fixed upon them ever since their keels were laid, no one knows who designed the *Warrior* or the *Agincourt*.

<sup>1</sup> The definition and classification of the useful and fine arts were fully treated of in 1849 in 'The True Principles of Beauty in Art,' by the author, to which

the reader is referred. What is here stated is the merest abstract of that treatise, but is sufficient, it is hoped, for the purposes of this volume.

In the late competition for the new Blackfriars Bridge no one cared who was the engineer to be appointed. Of those who competed, some suggested a three, some a five, others a seven arched bridge. Some were for wrought, others for cast iron; some preferred stone, or granite, or brick. But that is all. The Common Council—like a Mediæval Chapter—had to decide on the number of arches, the material, and the expense. That done, there are a hundred men, any one of whom could build the bridge as well as the remaining ninety-nine. All the public cared to know was, that, whoever was employed, it certainly would be a better bridge of its class than any that had been built before. Exactly as it was with architecture in the Middle Ages, so it is now with engineering, and so it always must be when an art is cultivated on true principles.

In the present day any man can know more of astronomy or optics than was known to Newton, or can be a better chemist than Sir Humphry Davy. Any mechanic can make a better steam-engine than Watt, or a better power-loom than Crompton; and it requires no special ability to build a better ship or bridge than any that were built in the last century.

When, however, we come to the phonetic arts the case is widely different. We do not now find men writing better epics than Homer, or better dramas than Shakespeare; we do not see finer sculptures than those of Phidias, or more beautiful paintings than those of Raphael. In all these instances the individual must be everything, the age little or nothing. So completely do we feel this, that, while we are prepared to give thousands of pounds for an original picture by any great master, we will not give one hundred or even as many shillings for a copy, though that may be so perfect that, if seen under the same circumstances, not one man in a thousand could detect which was the original. We treasure a statue by Canova or Flaxman if we know it to be genuine, or a sketch by Reynolds or Hogarth, or a fragment of a drama by Shakespeare, or of a tale by Walter Scott—though far better things may have been done by those masters themselves or by others; but it is the individual who stamps the value on everything in these arts, and they are prized accordingly.

The fact of an æsthetic element being added to useful art, though it obliterates to a certain extent the broad line of demarcation between the two groups, does not alter in the least the process by which excellence must be attained in the Technic, as contradistinguished from that to be followed in the Phonetic arts.

Mineralogy and Metallurgy have been refined into Jewellery and Orfèvrerie, Pottery into all the forms of Ceramic art, Weaving into Embroidery, Dyeing into Tapisserie, by exactly the same process which distinguishes every other step in these manufactures.

Every *useful* art is in fact capable of being refined into a *fine* art,



so as not only to supply the sensual wants, but also to gratify the intellectual desires of mankind, but that can only be done by gradually elaborating its special advantages, never by borrowing from other arts.

To return to the three primary divisions—Cooking may be refined into Gastronomy, Tailoring into an important art without a name, and Building into Architecture. Identically the same process which makes the difference between a boiled neck of mutton and a dish of *côtelettes à l'Impériale*, or converts the working dress of a housemaid into the coronation robes of a queen, can convert the most commonplace building merely designed for shelter into a Palace or a Temple.

So long as this path was followed, progress was achieved in Architecture as in all the technic fine arts by every people of every nation, even the most savage ; wherever it has been abandoned, success has become impossible.

So completely is all this practically acknowledged, that no one ever dreams of altering the poem of even a very inferior poet or of improving a statue or a picture, though they may be only the second-class works of artists of no special eminence. But in the Middle Ages no one ever hesitated to rebuild the nave of a cathedral or to add towers or chapels in the newest fashion to the oldest churches. No Comptroller of the Navy ever hesitated to cut one of Sir W. Symonds' ships in two if by lengthening her he could improve her qualities. No one regretted the pulling down of Old London Bridge, nor has any one suggested that Westminster or Blackfriars should be rebuilt exactly as they originally were out of respect to the memory of Labeyle or Mylne.

On the other hand, it would be considered sacrilege to meddle with or attempt to improve St. Paul's Cathedral out of respect for Wren ; Blenheim must remain the most uncomfortable of palaces because it was so left by Vanbrugh, and even Barry's Parliament Houses have become a fixed quantity that no one must interfere with. In fact, the individual is now everything in Architectural Art, while the age is of as little importance as in a poem or a picture.

A history of Poetry without the names of the authors of the poems must be as unreadable as it would be unintelligible, while a collection of the Lives of the Poets is one of the most interesting works that can be written, and it adds immensely to the interest of a poem to know the circumstances under which it was written. The same is true to a very great extent as regards Painting and Sculpture. In these arts the genius and taste of the individual artist are always uppermost in our mind, and whether he belonged to an ancient or to a modern school, whether he could or could not draw or colour, is of comparatively little consequence. It is the mind that guided the hand that

interests or speaks to our hearts through every difficulty and every disguise.

With Architecture the case is widely different. We do not know, or care to know, the name of a single Egyptian or Indian architect. But any one who has travelled in India may have seen in the present century such buildings rising before his eyes as the ghauts at Benares, the tombs and palaces at Deeg, the temples of Southern India—and if he had inquired, he would have found that they were being erected by local masons—men who could neither read, write, nor draw, but who can design at this hour as beautiful buildings as any that ever graced that land.

[THE LESSON TO BE DERIVED FROM NATIVE INDIAN ARCHITECTURE :—The odd way in which the ancient building arts are still carried on by the people of India has occasionally been impressed upon us as a serious critical study. When a work even of magnitude is projected by native authorities, for their own native purposes, they do not proceed as we do upon drawings of the design previously considered and settled *in camera* ; but, establishing themselves upon the spot selected for the site, and setting out their plan in a simple way, they plant the proper artisans upon this ground, each one in his own place and his own turn, and, as it were, tell them to set to work—allowing the building and all that pertains to its completeness to become evolved out of the inner consciousness of these workmen. This, we are told, is the mode that has produced all the highly elaborated monuments of architectural art in ancient and modern times throughout the East ; and we are invited to consider whether it is not a very proper mode. Not only so, but it is suggested that it is to a similar practice that we are indebted for the grand ecclesiastical works of Mediæval Europe; and on this ground we are all the more urgently asked to recognise it. A somewhat kindred principle was at one time inculcated by Burges—always paradoxical, but in this case not so much so as he often was—namely, that an architect ought to devote himself wholly to a single building at a time, lodging on the spot with his assistants, and directing the workmen personally from hour to hour. But this notion, on closer inspection, is seen to have essentially a different object from the Oriental practice, for in the East there is no architect or universally-directing designer at all. It seems on the other hand to be admitted that in the Middle Ages there always was employed at least a “master of the works.” At all events, the Eastern practice operates in this way :—each artisan in himself, more or less unaided, is the portable embodiment of a certain narrow specialty or personal method of workmanship, including the design and the execution together, which he has learnt from his father and will teach to his son, and from which he will never attempt to deviate. The constructive system and the decorative system, as a single and entire *modus operandi*, he can only administer in one accustomed way ; and for the achievement of novelty, even of variety, nothing can be done



by the employer of such artisans but to lay out an unaccustomed plan on the ground and employ workmen who use a locally unfamiliar method. Regarded critically, perhaps this accounts for the very remarkable way in which the building decoration of India seems to have long ago lost touch with the motive of construction. It is, perhaps, fair to say that so-called Indian Architecture is not architecture at all, but superficial decoration and absolutely nothing else. When the Parisian mason sometimes puts up a heavy Italian cornice in block stone and then proceeds to set out the enriched detail so that the joints flagrantly disagree with the carving, the more prosaic Englishman cannot help saying it is a pity he did not adjust his blocks beforehand to suit his ornament, seeing that he cannot adjust the ornament afterwards to suit the blocks; but what is done by the Oriental mason, or plasterer, or wood-carver, seems to be, not occasionally to make a thoughtless blunder like this, but invariably to put his material together on one principle and subsequently decorate the surfaces on another. Perhaps it may be suggested that to some extent the practice of carving in the solid rock may have led to this dissociation of the features of decoration from the features of construction; or perhaps the Oriental is by nature more an ornamentalist than a builder; but be this as it may, it seems at least plain that there is nothing in this Indian system of *One man one pattern* which to us is of any use. We may fairly add that the unlettered and wholly mechanical "designer," or rather worker of such a school would neither expect nor care to have his name enrolled in the records of artistic enterprise; he is both too dull and too lazy.—ED.]

For the same reason, no one has cared to record the names of the designers of the mediæval cathedrals; probably few knew even then who the architects were, more than we know now who designed our ships of war; and if we understood the principles of the art, it would be of the least possible interest to us to know who they were. The art was a true art, and it was more difficult to do wrong then, than it is to do right now. No genius, however great, could then enable an individual to get much ahead of his compeers, while the most ordinary ability enabled any one to do as well as the rest.

But in our age, when Painting, Sculpture, and Architecture are classed as sister arts, and it is assumed they may be conducted on the same principles, the case is widely different. Painting and Sculpture, as just remarked, are essentially Phonetic arts, *i.e.*, arts used either to perpetuate or accentuate vocal utterances, or to supplement what is written, and they effect this generally by imitating existing things.

In Egypt these two arts took the place of writing entirely, and, owing to there being no alphabet, became hieroglyphical, and were actually the only mode of recording speech. Since the invention of the alphabet, they have ceased to be the principal mode of recording thoughts, and can only be regarded as supplemental to written modes

of expression. They possess, from their power of imitation and peculiar vividness of representation, many advantages over the mere *littera scripta* in many circumstances; still they are, and always were, parts of the same class of things.

Such a series of pictures, for instance, as the *Rake's Progress* or the story of the *Two Apprentices* by Hogarth, are original novels written with the brush; and nine-tenths of our paintings and sculptures are merely transpositions of passages in books expressing in another form what had before been recorded alphabetically. The rest are imitative representations of persons or things.

Speaking, Writing, Painting, Sculpture, are merely different modes in which men's thoughts can be communicated to other men, or perpetuated for the use of posterity. But with these Architecture has nothing in common; it neither illustrates any literature nor imitates anything. Its object is to supply wants of a totally distinct class, and it reaches its aims by an entirely different mode.

Architecture is in fact nothing more than the æsthetic form of the purely Technic art of building, and can only be elaborated successfully on the same principles which guide and govern all the purely Technic arts. If all this is clearly appreciated it will easily be perceived that the really great change that was introduced into the practice of Architecture at the Reformation was this: a Technic art came to be cultivated on the principles which belong only to one of the Phonetic class. After this it would be ridiculous to talk of St. Peter's without naming Michael Angelo, or St. Paul's without alluding to Wren, or Blenheim or the Parliament Houses without the name of Vanbrugh or Barry. Though the cause has hardly been understood, this has been so essentially felt, that hardly any one has attempted to write a continuous history of the Renaissance styles of Architecture; but Vasari, Milizia, De Quincey, and many others have written the lives of the most eminent architects. So completely is it a fact that a building has now become the expression of an individual mind, that, were it not that it will be convenient to follow the same system in treating of the *modern*, as has been adopted in describing the *ancient* forms of Architectural Art, it might be well to profit by their example in the following pages. The "Lives" will always be more interesting than the history, and more pleasant to read; but it is only so, because the art is cultivated on mistaken principles which can never conduce to progress or lead towards the attainment of perfection.

The first inconvenience of this new system is that it subjects Art to the caprices and vagaries of an individual intellect, which, if good, would have added value to a work of true Art, but, if bad, proclaims its deficiencies in every part of a design. It has the further inconvenience that what a man learns in his lifetime dies with him, and his successor has to begin at the beginning, and, following what may be a totally



different track, their careers neither assist nor probably even cross each other. But perhaps the greatest inconvenience is the remarkably small amount of thought of any kind that a modern building ever displays. An architect in practice never can afford many hours to the artistic elaboration of his design. The plan, the details, the specifications may occupy weeks—in large buildings probably months—but once drawn, it is done with. In almost all cases the pillars, the cornices, the windows, the details are not only repeated over and over again in every part, but are probably all borrowed from some other building of some other age, and, to save trouble, the one half of the building is only a reversed tracing of the other. In one glance you see it all. With five minutes' study you have mastered the whole design, and penetrated into every principle that guided the architect in making it ; and so difficult is it to express thought where utility must be consulted, and where design is controlled by construction, that the result is generally meagre and unsatisfactory in the extreme. In a work of true art, such as a mediæval cathedral for instance, the case is different. Not only is there built into it the accumulated thought of all the men who had occupied themselves with building during the preceding centuries, and each of whom had left his legacy of thought to be incorporated with the rest, but you have the dream and aspiration of the bishop, who designed it : of all his clergy, who took an interest in it ; of the master mason, who was skilled in construction ; of the carver, the painter, the glazier, of the host of men who, each in his own craft, knew all that had been done before them, and had spent their lives in struggling to surpass the works of their forefathers. It is more than even this : there is not one shaft, one moulding, one carving, not one chisel-mark in such a building, that was not designed specially for the place where it is found, and which was not the best that the experience of the age could invent for the purposes to which it is applied ; nothing was borrowed, and nothing that was designed for one purpose was used for another. You may wander in such a building for weeks or for months together, and never know it all. A thought or a motive peeps out through every joint, and is manifest in every moulding, and the very stones speak to you with a voice as clear and as easily understood as the words of the poet or the teaching of the historian. Hence, in fact, the little interest we can ever feel in even the stateliest of modern buildings, and the undying, never-satisfied interest with which we study, over and over again, those which have been produced under a different and truer system of Art.

All this is as true of Classical Art as it is of Gothic, though we have not the same means of judging of it. It is certainly equally true of the Indian styles, and even the quaint, grotesque style of the Chinese acquires a certain amount of dignity from this cause to which it certainly is not entitled for any other quality of design.

The evils pointed out above have been aggravated in modern times by Architecture being handed over too exclusively to professional men—to men who live by it and make it their business, and who generally succeed more from their business-like habits than their artistic powers. It was well said by Victor Hugo, "Ceci tuera cela : le Livre tuera l'Eglise." The doom of Architecture was sealed from that hour when Literature became the only object of study, and the only aim of a polite education ; and more especially when the poetry, the eloquence, the history, or the philosophy of the Classical periods were alone considered worthy to occupy the attention of the upper classes. They still might admire or occupy themselves with Painting and Sculpture, in so far as they were or could be employed to illustrate that Literature, or might admire buildings which recalled it ; but Architecture ceased to be a matter of education or a requisite part of the knowledge of a gentleman, it ceased to occupy their serious attention, and consequently became professional—a matter of business, and no longer the dream of poetic or the occupation of refined and educated minds. Though the architects might be, and very often were, men of genius and of taste, they had not the leisure requisite to elaborate their designs, and were always under the disadvantage of working out designs for other parties, and controlled either by a want of taste on the part of their employers, or an unwillingness to spend the money requisite to carry out a design artistically. It was no longer, in fact, the natural form of utterance, or the occupation and favourite recreation of the best educated and most refined classes of the modern nations of Europe ; and it need hardly be added that, even from this cause alone, it must have sunk very far below the level at which it formerly had stood.

[THE PROFESSIONAL ARCHITECT : THE SOCIALIST PRINCIPLE FOR ART-WORK :—All students of the Philosophy of Art must take especial care in these days not to be misled by doctrinarians. Amongst other things there has arisen in several forms an idea, professing to be purely practical and workmanlike, not at all theoretical or scholastic, to the effect that the art-worker, whether called artist or artisan, is bound in fetters by a class of middlemen, mere commercial dealers and shop-keepers, who must be swept away *in toto* if true art is ever to flourish as it ought. Art is too ethereal a thing to be carried to the market ; it evaporates on the way. The market—in the person of any middleman—shall not even enter the studio or the workshop. Producer and consumer must come together—or rather the admiring consumer must come to the admired producer—without any of that intervention of a base mechanical kind which, too obviously for argument, must in the very nature of such things, demolish all the charm of the transaction. Of course there is a great deal to be said, and to the great satisfaction of impulsive genius, in favour of a proposition so poetical ; but on the other hand it is affirmed, with greater soberness if with less enthusiasm,



that the middleman in these days is, in fact, the third and connecting link without which the other two would entirely fail to be joined in any way whatever. No doubt the dealer, contractor, "master," or other middleman, is too often a mere counting-house trader, and occasionally a good deal of an impostor; but suppose he is, are there no other "masters" mere traders and even impostors, whom we nevertheless cannot dispense with? In truth there may be a great many more than we can conveniently identify. But suppose he is not—a much more reasonable assumption, for it is not imposture as a rule that thrives in any intellectual business—then what follows? In commercial phrasology, if "the distributor" is to be abolished, what is to be the consequence of his abolition? Simply the cessation of the distribution. All through the world, the distributor, the broker, the agent, the dealer, the middleman, is as essential to the exchange of goods for good things as the coin with which the exchange is effected, and perhaps more so. Let the art-producer insist upon improving the art-dealer by all means; but to talk of sweeping him aside in any degree is surely not the way in these days to better the situation.

Not unconnected with this new art-socialism in principle is the doctrine that the professional architect is a useless, indeed a pernicious middleman. One bold doctrinarian a few years ago went so far as to argue in the plainest terms that true architectural art could only be that which would be produced by the bricklayer, or the plasterer, under the inspiration of his own initiative. Let us say the mason, the carver, or the plasterer, as in India, and the irrationality is less conspicuous; at any rate the meaning was that there must not be any academical architect to conventionalise artisanship, which was supposed to have high merit of its own essence. But it is surely useless to enter into argument, with a practical critic, on any such basis. The architect, regarded as an artist directing artisans, is obviously the trained and accepted commander of their artisanship, the "chief of the workmen," the embodiment of a harmonious result for all their several artisanships combined. Especially at the present day, when the architect has in a great many instances expanded into the universal architectural artist, or master of the many fine-arts of building, it accords with reason, and no practical artisan will deny it, that his command is what stands between miscellaneous artisanship and failure—failure certainly to meet the difficult demands of the ever-advancing fastidiousness, culture, and haste of modern civilisation. Improve architects by all means; indeed they are being very rapidly improved everywhere by natural development; but, instead of abolishing them, the certainty rather is that society must classify them, applying in this as in all else the great principle of the subdivision of labour and skill for the supply of the increasing exigencies of life. If a few words more may be added, let it be remembered with regret, if not with shame, that to ordinary Englishmen

the architect is as yet only a broker of building, who, for an agreed payment, undertakes to save much more in money than he costs; and that it is chiefly this architect who is getting to be more and more in demand all over the country. On the other hand, although the artistic designer of high class is a man of another order, it might be surprising to many who talk glibly of the difference, if they could come to know how creditably the inferior class of men are every day acquiring those qualifications which enable and entitle them to commingle and take rank with the superior.—*Ed.*]

Another and cognate circumstance that mainly influenced the fate of Architecture at this period was, that most of those who first practised it at the time the revolution took place were either amateurs or sculptors and painters. Alberti may be named as among the earliest and the most distinguished of the first class. Among the latter, it is hardly necessary to name Michael Angelo, Raphael, Giulio Romano, Peruzzi, Leonardo da Vinci, &c. Of all these men, the last named alone had the peculiar mechanical and mathematical form of mind which may enable a man to dispense with educational training. The consequences of this might easily have been foreseen. All painters can make architectural designs for the backgrounds of their pictures, and many of them do it with excellent effect. Where they want shadows they have porticoes at command; where too large a flat space occurs, it is easy to break it up with pilasters; cornices and string courses contrast well with vertical lines, and niches alternating with windows give variety; while domes and spires may break the sky-line to any extent. All this is easy, and may all be sketched in a morning. But if any one supposes that such a design will make a permanently satisfactory building, he knows little of the demands of a true art, and how little its requirements are to be met by such child's play. It must nevertheless be confessed that this is too much the mode in which modern designs are made: it is just because they are so constructed that they are so generally failures.

A technic art, when up to the mark, requires for its practice not only the devotion of a life on the part of the master, but all his subordinates must each be able to perform independently the task assigned to him. In the art of ship-building, civil or mechanical engineering, mentioned above, from the master who sits in his office and organises the whole, to the boy who sweeps out the workshop, every one must be skilled in his own speciality, and every one able to perform, more or less perfectly, the task of every one below him; all must know and be able to introduce every improvement and refinement that has been practised elsewhere up to that hour. With such an organisation as this, perfection is now attained in the mechanical arts. With a similar combination, perfection was reached in Architecture in the Middle



Ages; and the attempt to supersede this, and to introduce the plan of designing by the sketches of an individual, is really the root of the difference between the two systems. Even now it never could have been carried through, unless Architecture had been reduced to its simplest form of expression. Unless a modern architect is allowed to borrow his pillars, his cornices, his details, wholesale from some other building, he never could get on. He must either, under pretence of looking like the Classical architects, make his buildings uniformly simple, or, fancying he is emulating the Gothic architects, make them designedly irregular, or he never could get through with his work. In the present state of the art, no one man, however skilled, could properly think out all the details of even one important building in a lifetime; and, without a reorganisation of the whole system, we must in consequence be content to allow copying to the fullest extent, and must be satisfied with shams, either Classical or Mediæval, until at least the public are better instructed, and demand or initiate a recurrence to the principles that guided the architects of those ages when true and real buildings were produced.

[THE ENGLISH COUNTERFEIT OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY:—I, we turn to the consideration of the indiscriminate imitation of old examples of all schools by the English architects of the Nineteenth Century—whose motives, of course, we of the same class are best able to understand—the first excuse that appears to offer itself is that in certain instances the work of designing a building has to be done after the manner of making a toy. To take a well-known extreme case: if King George the Fourth desired to have a lodging at Brighton in the guise of an Oriental pagoda, no one could prevent him, and those who cared to laugh, whether at the pagoda or at the King, could do so. But let us carry the imitative principle far enough to ask, Where shall imitation stop? Perhaps this question cannot be conveniently answered in the abstract; let us then take a very different case—one which we need not at all hesitate to answer. It certainly must be admitted that the imitation which constitutes the reproduction of Mediæval Art in our current church building is in practice as meritorious as the Brighton Pavilion is the reverse, and in theory a perfectly legitimate act of design on the peculiar ground which it occupies. Shall we say, then, that the reproduction of the highest order of antique Classic art in such a temple as the Paris Madeleine is not equally legitimate? Our great porticoes and peristyles also, when thoroughly well handled and appropriately placed, would it not be preposterous to call anything else than the noblest art?

Architectural history moves slowly, and nothing can be more obvious than the fact that imitation and copying within certain limits must be found in the very essence of its development. Not only so, but Architecture is a single art of and belonging to the whole world, not

ten or twenty different arts for so many different localities. We have one humanity ; one building science ; one building art. Whoever and wherever you may be, all that can be done is to take a step forward. And thus it is, in these modern times of ours, we are so closely identified with a contemplation of the past universally and intimately, the broadest and the deepest that can be achieved, that we come to be not only philosophically entitled, but unconsciously compelled, to imitate and copy whatever we find to suit our purpose best. Human intelligence, like the rest, naturally chooses the line of least resistance. For miscellaneous modern European buildings, therefore, may it not be said to be obvious that the most appropriate style, and the natural style of development, was, and still is, that which the Romans had so long been steadily developing for the same purposes as ours, and on the same ground, till Gothic conquest and the Gothic form of Christianity interrupted its progress, and established for a time, for a different world, a different mode ? So also, for the recently resuscitated ecclesiasticism of England, may we not say that the only proper style of building must be that of the old ecclesiasticism, which was the basis and root of the new ? Why should the French be reproached for building the beautiful Madeleine, or the English for covering the land with charming Gothic churches, or the gentlemen of Pall Mall for going to the Rome and Venice of not so very long ago to get models for their club-houses ? In each case what was done was, in the circumstances, certainly one of the right things to do, and one of the best : an act of "natural selection" of surely the simplest, the most convenient, and the least arbitrary kind. Suffice it to say as a last word that the ancient Romans, the cinquecentist Italians, and the modern Europeans, obviously form in architectural history one continuous dynasty. And in like manner the general artistic Mediæval church and the locally revived artistic English church are directly mother and daughter ; the ardour and poetic skillfulness with which our Victorian Gothicists have followed up, under many disadvantages, the work of their ancestors in art, being one of the most creditable chapters in the whole world-story of building. Doctrine like this, however, it must be remembered, is not the same as the Eclecticism of the time before Pugin, when an accomplished architect was simply a designer of anything that was wanted in any old style that was dictated, with reason or without. It may not be easy, perhaps, for the student to see at once that all styles are excluded here—for English ground—except the genuine modernised Classic and the genuine modernised Mediæval (with our own domestic Elizabethan as a local connecting link) : but let him think the matter out.—Ed.]

[THE EXPERIMENTAL CONTINUITY OF HISTORICAL ARCHITECTURE :—The very natural idea that Architecture is an art of various styles, which have been produced and practised in various countries, and that some of these are good and some bad, some beyond improvement



and some beneath criticism, ought to be accepted with an important qualification; and it will be seen on a moment's reflection that, in our own day especially, when the architectural community as a whole distinctly maintains its right to appropriate various old modes of design at pleasure as may be found practically advisable, some such qualification will probably be of special importance. In a word, the principle at once suggests itself that, inasmuch as the history of building is concurrent with that of the human race, and the history of the race, notwithstanding the diversity of nations and eras, a single history in which one generation is the successor of another in respect of all its acquisitions, so also the history of all building, and therefore of all Architecture as the fine-art of building, must possess a corresponding unity and continuity, in spite of such varieties as are due to time and place. Nor is this an abstract proposition only. The intelligent student may not merely find himself largely aided in his endeavours to appreciate the peculiarities of modern taste, for good or ill, by identifying its beginnings directly with the ending of the old Roman on the one hand, and of the Mediæval on the other; he may also not merely follow backwards in like manner the Mediæval to the Roman, and the Roman to the Greek, and trace the origin of the Greek in the antecedent Egyptian and Assyrian; thus far the ground has been well trodden; but he may still more profitably pursue similar inquiries along the narrower lines of collateral progression, and, if sufficiently fortunate, may be able to account for every feature in every style on the same logical ground, not of imitation, still less of counterfeit, but always of natural development. Even where the intercourse of mankind was weakest, it was still strong enough to do its work, and only took a longer time to accomplish it. The "ages" of our history are not the successive centuries of duration, but the successive eras of development, some longer, some shorter; and the development as a whole is one human career, in which the nations have been all working to one end—one stream with many tributaries, albeit that many of these tributaries are in themselves famous streams. In the arts is not this particularly evident? One result of such a train of reflection must be this: that we shall be the better able to consider and discuss all modes, great and small, meritorious or not, academically recognised or not, with that judicial calmness and patience which so materially promote a correct judgment, and without that impulsive haste and heat which go so far to prevent it. Thus it will become more and more manifest that, from the beginning of civilisation to the present age, we—the whole craft of us as architects, from the very earliest of unknown names and times and places—everywhere have been constantly and continuously trying experiments, frequently failing, but sometimes succeeding, and always making such way as we might. Moreover, this will help the student to judge for himself all the better when violent contrasts of generalisation are presented for his acceptance. Such, for

example, is the contrast between Pagan and Christian—a formula of prejudice intended to supplant one still more contemptuous in the other direction, namely, that between Classic and Gothic. The question of National *versus* Exotic, again, will lose much of its force. So also will that of Living Art *versus* Dead Art. In fact it may be almost said that the subdivision of architectural history, when thoroughly studied, must eventually turn upon little else than the points of the cosmopolitan compass and the crisis of cosmopolitan time. At any rate, even already we may fairly remind ourselves that in architectural practice, most notably, we are the heirs of the tentative work of all the ages, and are bound to form an unaffected and generous estimate of such an inheritance, in order to be enabled all the more easily to transmit it to another generation, certainly unimpaired, and probably augmented. This, be it observed, is not the “eclecticism” of the general practitioner of forty years ago, but rather the “catholicism” which Professor Cockerell was preaching at the same time, although but little understood. “The Battle of the Styles” demolished the shopkeeping eclecticism; perhaps the critical catholicity is only rising from its ruins now.—ED.]

## VI.—EXAMPLES.


In order to make as clear as possible the steps by which this downward change was effected, it may be well, before attempting to describe particular styles in detail, to examine one or two typical examples as illustrations of the change.

The first here chosen for this purpose is a house in the Griefswald (Woodcut No. 4), which is purely Gothic in design and detail, and a rich and pleasing example of its class. The base is solid and well-proportioned, all the upper parts are of good design, and the arrangements of the buttresses and the ornaments between them elegant and appropriate, if looked at from a purely Gothic point of view. Had it been the gable-end of one of the churches of that neighbourhood, or of some great civic hall, no fault could be found with it; but as it is the upper part of a house, and divided into five storeys, the verticality which is so appropriate in a church becomes unmeaning in a dwelling. The floors are not marked, and you are left in suspense whether the upper part is one great “solder” or loft, or is really divided by floors between each of the ranges of windows.

This was felt to be a defect by the architects of the day, and the consequence was, that, so soon as Domestic Architecture began to emancipate itself from the trammels of the ecclesiastical arrangements, and to assert its own importance, we find the string courses marking strongly and appropriately the floors into which the house was divided. In the next example, of a house in Brunswick (Woodcut No. 5), we find



this feeling strongly developed, and with very pleasing effect. The design is also interesting, as showing how readily the Classical details lent themselves for the nonce to the new exigencies of design. The Gothic architects may with justice pride themselves on the beauty of their clustered piers or traceried windows, the appropriateness for church purposes of their pointed arches, and the aspiring character of their pinnacles and spires; but they never invented, as they never wanted, a class of buildings in which the horizontal lines prevailed to a greater extent than the vertical. On the other hand, it is just



4.

House in the Grützwald. From Rosengarten, Arch. Stylarten.

on this point that Classical Architecture is strongest. Nothing has ever yet been done equal in combined richness and grace to the Corinthian entablature, or in strength or appropriateness to that of the Doric and plainer orders. It is no wonder, therefore, that details so perfectly appropriate were seized on with avidity by the architects of that day, which happened also to be just the time when the taste for Classical Literature was reviving, and men were eagerly affecting whatever reminded them of Rome and its greatness.

Having adapted the cornices to mark their floors, it was hardly possible they could avoid introducing the Classical pillars which formed

a part of the order. This was done timidly at first, and as mere ornaments, and, had the imitation remained there, no great harm would have been done; but it was a step in the wrong direction: it was employing ornament for mere ornament's sake, without reference to construction or the actual purpose of the building; and, once it was admitted that any class of ornament could be employed other than ornamented construction, or which had any other aim than to express—while it beautified—the prosaic exigencies of the design, there was



5.


House at Brunswick. From Rosengarten.

an end of all that is truthful or that can lead to perfection in Architectural Art.

It was a long time, however, before this became apparent, and most of the early Italian buildings of the fifteenth century are more beautiful than those which preceded them. Even so late as the middle of the sixteenth century we find such a design as this of the Grimani Palace at Venice (Woodcut No. 6), which embraces all the elegance of Classical Art with the most perfect appropriateness to the purposes of



a modern palace. Even the introduction of a mezzanine on the ground floor is so cleverly managed as not to be offensive, and the projection given to the upper cornice, in excess of that used in the lower orders, brings the whole into harmony. The most enthusiastic advocate of Gothic Architecture may be induced to admit that there is nothing of a palatial character, out of Venice, erected either in Italy or on this side of the Alps, so beautiful as the façades of this and the Vandramini, the Cornaro, and other palaces of this city. The only buildings that can fairly be compared with them are such as the Casa d'Oro, the Foscari, and others of their class in Venice itself. It may be argued that these



6.

Grimani Palace. From Cicognara.<sup>1</sup>

last are more picturesque and richer in detail ; but they certainly have neither the solidity nor the simple elegance of the more modern examples. Be this as it may, it was probably only in such examples that the Classical orders could be applied with appropriateness. It required a climate so warm as to admit of very large openings, and a street façade, all the storeys of which could be applied to state and festival purposes ; all the sleeping accommodation and offices being relegated to back courts and alleys. Hence the great difficulty, as we shall afterwards see, of applying the "orders" to English country houses, all four

<sup>1</sup> Fabbriche più cospicue di Venezia. Fol. 1815-20.

sides of which can be seen ; and where the upper storey was never, as in some Italian town-houses, as important and as dignified as the other two.

These requisites, however, were rarely found, and the consequence was, that the style soon passed into the next and worst stage of its existence. This is well illustrated by the annexed elevation of a palace at Vicenza, by the celebrated Palladio (Woodcut No. 7), which, though a fair specimen of the master, contains nearly all the faults inherent in the style. The principal order, running through the two principal storeys, and being composed merely of pilasters, loses all meaning and appropriateness. The entablature which these support is too important for a string course, and, having another storey over it, does not mark the roof ; which is the only real meaning a cornice ever can have when not employed as mere ornament. The angles, instead of being strength-



7. Valmarina Palace, Vicenza. From Palladio, *I quattro Libri dell' Architettura*.

ened, either by being brought forward or rusticated, are weakened by having two more storeys of windows inserted, and, instead of repeating one of the pilasters which encumber the centre, we have only a detached statue to support the great cornice—thus adding absurdity to weakness. We find, in short, in this design, ornamentation entirely divorced from construction. Not only is there an attempt to make the palace look like a building of a long previous age, but to make it appear as if it were one great hall, instead of a five-storeyed building, which every one sees that it is. In spite of the beauty and grandeur of the order employed, and in spite of all the elegance for which Palladio is so justly celebrated, we cannot but feel that Art had reached a form entirely different from that employed anywhere else, and was conducted on principles diametrically at variance with those which guided the architect who designed the buildings of either Classical or Mediæval times, or indeed of any true styles of Architecture.



The same defects of design prevail, to a greater or less extent, in every building erected from Palladio's time to our own day. In spite of all the grandeur of many of the palaces and churches built during that period, and in spite of all the beauty and elegance of the style employed, there is a falsehood and a striving at false effect running through the whole that always leaves an unpleasant impression on the mind of the spectator, and neutralises, to a great extent, beauties of design and detail which it would otherwise afford the highest gratification to contemplate.

The fact that since the revival of ancient learning all architects have been composing in a dead language is another point so important that it cannot be too strongly insisted on here. It not only has been the guiding principle of every design, but is the foundation of every criticism we utter. Nearly the same thing occurred in verbal literature in the first enthusiasm of the revival. No scientific treatise was considered worthy of the attention of the learned, unless clothed in the dignity of a Classic garb; and even such men as Milton and Gray were prouder of their Latin *poëmata* than of their immortal productions in the vernacular tongue.

The first effect of this state of things is, that the practice of the art is confined to a limited and especially educated class of architects; and what is far more disastrous is, that their productions are appreciated only by the small class of scholars or archaeologists who are really as learned, though probably not so practical, as themselves.

The learned in Art, for instance, go into ecstasies on observing the purity of style and correctness of composition which pervade every part of St. George's Hall, Liverpool. It recalls every association we ever felt in contemplating Classical Art, and reproduces all we ever dreamt of as great or good in the best age of that school. But common people do not feel this. They would not feel offended if the pillars were one diameter more or less in height, if the proportions of the entablature were altered, and even if the cornice were half or twice its proper projection. The absence of windows does not strike them as a beauty; on the contrary, they think that it gives a gloomy and prison-like aspect; and, in spite of all our preaching, they feel that a far more convenient and suitable building might have been got for half the expense. What an uneducated man would appreciate and admire would be elegance combined with common sense, while the only things that offend an educated man would be faults which are equivalent to false quantities and errors of grammar. If we were to apply to literature the same canons of criticism which we use in speaking of architectural designs, a Porson or a Bentley would be a far greater man than a Shakespeare or a Milton. The highly educated pride themselves on their learning, while the less educated classes prefer the works of a



8.

New Cathedral at Boulogne. From a Photograph.

Burns or a Walter Scott to the most finished productions of the most learned pedants.

If an architect should err a hand's breadth in the proper relative proportion between the diameter and the height of a Doric column, all the educated world cry shame on him ; and if he should venture to alter the distribution of the triglyphs, or attempt an interference with the mutules, he would be condemned for ever by professional critics. But if he applied the portico of the Parthenon one day to a County Jail, and the next attached the same feature to a Protestant House of Prayer or to a Panorama, the learned few would see no harm, provided the proportions were correct ; but we ought not to be surprised if the unlearned million should shake their heads in astonishment, and feel no great interest in the mysterious craft.

As, however, in this country at least, there are so many educated men, and as these only are allowed to have or to express any opinion on



the matter, it is extremely difficult to get this great fact properly appreciated ; and indeed it is difficult to find properly illustrative examples at home ; but abroad they crop up occasionally in a manner that shows clearly the true state of the case.

If any one, in passing through Boulogne, will climb up to the "Haute Ville," he will see there a new Cathedral Church (Woodcut No. 8), erected within the last thirty years. It owes its existence almost wholly to the energy and devotion of one man, the late Monsignore Haffreingue, who was, however, only a simple Abbé, when, in 1827, he conceived the idea of rebuilding the cathedral of his native city, destroyed at the Revolution ; and with success such as has seldom crowned a similar attempt since the Middle Ages, he lived to see his great work nearly completed. Its dimensions are considerable, being 330 feet long by 112 broad. It is surmounted by a dome 68 feet in diameter internally, and rising to a height of nearly 300 feet to the top of the cross externally. Its proportions are good, and the lighting is pleasing and effectively introduced. The whole is of stone, of an agreeable colour, and the construction is truthful throughout. Yet, notwithstanding all this, the church, to an educated man, is simply horrible. On entering he finds some pillars painfully attenuated, others stumpy beyond true Classical proportions ; he sees entablatures put where they have no business to be, and omitted where their presence, according to his rules, is indispensable. The building is, in fact, full of false quantities and errors of grammar, and he is shocked beyond expression at the ignorance it displays in every part. But the inhabitants of Boulogne do not see this. To them it is a more beautiful building than the Walhalla or the Madeleine, because it has the form of a Christian church, which they understand, and because its parts answer the constructive purpose for which they were designed. All this they can see with their own eyes, while they are profoundly ignorant of how these details were used by the Greeks or Romans.

The new parish church of the little agricultural village of Mouta, in the island of Malta, is perhaps even a more remarkable instance of a building erected in the same manner, and according to the exact principles, which covered Europe with beautiful edifices during the Middle Ages, though the actual result (like that at Boulogne) and the style are as different from those of a Mediæval building as well can be.

It seems that about the year 1812 the villagers first conceived the idea of enlarging their church, and were warmly seconded in the idea by their pastor, the Rev. Felice Calleja. The cholera, and various local misfortunes, again and again diverted the funds that had been collected for this purpose, so that nothing had been done at Calleja's death, in 1833, beyond collecting a fund of little more than 3000*l.* for the purpose of rebuilding the church. His successor, Giovanni Schembri, was equally zealous, and, with the assistance of a grant of about 500*l.* a-year



8.

New Cathedral at Boulogne. From a Photograph.

Burns or a Walter Scott to the most finished productions of the most learned pedants.

If an architect should err a hand's breadth in the proper relative proportion between the diameter and the height of a Doric column, all the educated world cry shame on him ; and if he should venture to alter the distribution of the triglyphs, or attempt an interference with the mutules, he would be condemned for ever by professional critics. But if he applied the portico of the Parthenon one day to a County Jail, and the next attached the same feature to a Protestant House of Prayer or to a Panorama, the learned few would see no harm, provided the proportions were correct ; but we ought not to be surprised if the unlearned million should shake their heads in astonishment, and feel no great interest in the mysterious craft.

As, however, in this country at least, there are so many educated men, and as these only are allowed to have or to express any opinion on



the matter, it is extremely difficult to get this great fact properly appreciated; and indeed it is difficult to find properly illustrative examples at home; but abroad they crop up occasionally in a manner that shows clearly the true state of the case.

If any one, in passing through Boulogne, will climb up to the "Haute Ville," he will see there a new Cathedral Church (Woodcut No. 8), erected within the last thirty years. It owes its existence almost wholly to the energy and devotion of one man, the late Monsignore Haffreingue, who was, however, only a simple Abbé, when, in 1827, he conceived the idea of rebuilding the cathedral of his native city, destroyed at the Revolution; and with success such as has seldom crowned a similar attempt since the Middle Ages, he lived to see his great work nearly completed. Its dimensions are considerable, being 330 feet long by 112 broad. It is surmounted by a dome 68 feet in diameter internally, and rising to a height of nearly 300 feet to the top of the cross externally. Its proportions are good, and the lighting is pleasing and effectively introduced. The whole is of stone, of an agreeable colour, and the construction is truthful throughout. Yet, notwithstanding all this, the church, to an educated man, is simply horrible. On entering he finds some pillars painfully attenuated, others stumpy beyond true Classical proportions; he sees entablatures put where they have no business to be, and omitted where their presence, according to his rules, is indispensable. The building is, in fact, full of false quantities and errors of grammar, and he is shocked beyond expression at the ignorance it displays in every part. But the inhabitants of Boulogne do not see this. To them it is a more beautiful building than the Walhalla or the Madeleine, because it has the form of a Christian church, which they understand, and because its parts answer the constructive purpose for which they were designed. All this they can see with their own eyes, while they are profoundly ignorant of how these details were used by the Greeks or Romans.


The new parish church of the little agricultural village of Mousa, in the island of Malta, is perhaps even a more remarkable instance of a building erected in the same manner, and according to the exact principles, which covered Europe with beautiful edifices during the Middle Ages, though the actual result (like that at Boulogne) and the style are as different from those of a Mediæval building as well can be.

It seems that about the year 1812 the villagers first conceived the idea of enlarging their church, and were warmly seconded in the idea by their pastor, the Rev. Felice Calleja. The cholera, and various local misfortunes, again and again diverted the funds that had been collected for this purpose, so that nothing had been done at Calleja's death, in 1833, beyond collecting a fund of little more than 3000*l.* for the purpose of rebuilding the church. His successor, Giovanni Schembri, was equally zealous, and, with the assistance of a grant of about 500*l.* a-year

for ten years from the funds of the diocese, and the gratuitous labour of the villagers and others, the work was so far completed that, in February, 1860, the parish priest was enabled to announce from the altar that it was time to pull down the old church. Before the following Sunday not one stone of it remained, and high mass was celebrated for the first time at the altar of the new church.<sup>1</sup>

The leading idea of the design was that the church should be a copy of the Pantheon at Rome, and was adopted principally because it could be built around and over the old church without interfering with it, in order that the villagers might worship in the church of their forefathers till their new edifice was ready for consecration ;—all which was done.

Although the merit of the original suggestion of the design is due to a local architect of the name of Grognet, the real architect of the



9. Plan of Church at Vorell.  
Scale 160 feet to 1 inch.

building was the village mason—Angelo Gatt. Like a master-mason in the Middle Ages, or those men who build the most exquisite temples or tombs in India at the present day, he can neither read, nor write, nor draw ; but, following his own constructive instincts and the dictates of common sense, he has successfully carried out every part of this building. It was he who insisted on erecting the dome without scaffolding, and showed how it could be done by simply notching each course on to the one below it. With true mediæval enthusiasm, this extraordinary man was content to devote his whole time to the erection of this great edifice, receiving only fifteen pence a day for


twenty years. He now receives two shillings, at which he is content to superintend its completion. In every respect, in fact, the building is Mediæval, except one. Instead of Gatt and his brother masons working in a style which they understood, or which grew naturally out of the forms they were using, in all the ornamental details of their work they were following drawings selected from books by Grognet or some one else ; but, as neither he nor they were well versed in the language of their choice, there are faults of grammar and false quantities apparent everywhere in the building. The villagers, fortunately, are too ignorant to perceive this, and are naturally proud, as they ought to be, of their church and

<sup>1</sup> The whole expense was about 21,000*l.*, besides gratuitous labour estimated at half that amount.



their master-mason. It is sad, however, that a building so noble in dimensions and design<sup>1</sup> should be marred by an attempt to introduce a style of ornamentation which none of the villagers understood, and that the dome, which in size ranks third among the Christian domes of Europe, should fail in producing the effect it is entitled to, simply because we have no style but what we borrow from the dead.

Had the designers of this building only got a learned architect to look over their design, and to correct the details, it would have been one of the most beautiful, as it is one of the most remarkable, churches in Europe. It pleases those who worship in it quite as much, or



perhaps more, than if its details had been purely Classical; but it is so distasteful to the educated man, that he turns from it more with a feeling of disgust than with anything like the pleasure its dimensions and form ought to produce.

There is still a third example in the cathedral at Gran, now erecting from the designs and at the expense of the Primate of Hungary. Its dimensions are those of a first-rate cathedral, and its general form is pleasing enough; but the mode in which its entab-

<sup>1</sup> It will be seen from the section (Woodcut No. 16) that the dome is higher internally than that of the Pantheon at

Rome, but about 20 feet less in diameter. It, however, exceeds in diameter that of St. Paul's, London, by 16 feet.

lature is cut about and bent over windows, and the details of its campaniles, are painful in the extreme ; and, worse than this, the drum of its dome is surrounded by thirty-eight columns, attenuated to such an extent as would justify a spire of almost Gothic form ; but instead of this, they are surmounted by a dome of lower section than that of the Pantheon at Rome ; and indeed throughout the building there are the same defects of detail which are observable in the two last-named examples.

All this is not so obvious in Gothic as in Classic revivals, for the



11.

View of Church at Mousa. From a Photograph.

simple reason that it is easier for an Englishman to express himself in Old-English or even Anglo-Saxon—if he chooses to get it up—than in dead or foreign languages. We admire the purity of style and correctness of detail in recent Gothic churches, or in the Parliament Houses, just as we might admire them in St. George's Hall or the Berlin Museum ; and we feel convinced that, if Sir Charles Barry or any other of our Gothic architects had been asked for a report on an estate, he could have given it in the exact character and with the same terms as one finds in Domesday Book, or, if desired, in the Early



English forms and expressions of the old Exchequer Rolls. Most people would prefer a more modern style of writing or diction ; but an archaeologist would go into ecstasies if the imitation were perfect. This is, in fact, all we aim at and all we attain in the Architectural Art of the present day. We intrust its exercise to a specially educated class, most learned in the details of the style they are called upon to work in, and they produce buildings which delight the scholars and archaeologists of the day, but which the less educated classes can neither understand nor appreciate, and which will lose their significance the moment the fashion which produced them has passed away.

The difference between this artificial state of things and the practice of a true style will not now be difficult to understand. When, for instance, Gothic was a living art in England, men expressed themselves in it as easily as in any other part of the vernacular. Whatever was done was a part of the usual, ordinary, everyday life, and men had no more difficulty in understanding what others were doing than in comprehending what they were saying. A mason did not require to be a learned man to chisel what he had carved ever since he was a boy, and what alone he had seen being done during his lifetime ; and he adopted new forms just in the same manner and as naturally as men adopt new modes of expression in language, as they happen to be introduced, without even remarking it. At that time, any educated man could design in Gothic Art, just as any man who can read and write can now compose and give utterance to any poetry or prose that may be in him.

Where Art is a true art, it is as naturally practised, and as easily understood, as a vernacular literature ; of which, indeed, it is an essential and most expressive part : and so it was in Greece and Rome, and so, too, in the Middle Ages. But with us it is little more than a dead corpse, galvanised into spasmodic life by a few selected practitioners, for the amusement and delight of a small section of the specially educated classes. It expresses truthfully neither our wants nor our feelings, and we ought not, therefore, to be surprised how very unsatisfactory every modern building really is, even when executed by the most talented architects, as compared with the productions of any village mason or parish priest at an age when men sought only to express clearly what they felt strongly, and sought to do it only in their own natural mother-tongue, untrammelled by the fetters of a dead or unfamiliar foreign form of speech.

[LIVING ARCHITECTURE AND LIFELESS :—The question raised by this contrast of terms for the most serious consideration of the modern architectural student, whether young or not, must not be supposed to be one that he will understand at a glance : and it is doubtful whether the amateur can understand it at all. It is very easy to talk of all modern work being lifeless, inanimate, soulless, spiritless, and so on ; and of

ancient work being always instinct with vitality, reality, and natural principle. The life of an architectural composition lies deep within it : it is not easily introduced when it has been forgotten in the mixing, nor is it easily eliminated when it has not. In the very first place, it is fundamentally a question of the construction ; and this is why the amateur—who is never a constructor, but, at the best, a superficialist—cannot appreciate it with any thoroughness.

Suppose we take the earliest important design of the “living” class to be a Greek Doric peristylar temple—giving the go-by to the Egyptian for obvious convenience of argument. The exercise in criticism which this example offers may not prove to be very readable ; but if the reader will consent to think it out, it may be all the more useful in an age when architectural sins are so many, and saints so few. Let this temple, then, be presented for our criticism by means only of a perspective drawing of the exterior, without the masonry jointing. The question then is, how ought we to read its motive in the language of construction ? Let us try. First an oblong chamber, or cella, has been enclosed by a stone wall, having a single opening for a doorway in the middle of one end. Then around this cella a narrow level platform has been built, with three steps all along the outward edge. On this platform, or stylobate, stone columns have been set up at regular intervals, constituting a peristyle. Then from column to column there has been laid a level course of stone lintels—the architrave ; and a second level course of masonry has been placed on this—the frieze. A third and last level course has then been added on all four sides, but projecting forward considerably—the cornice. This projecting course is evidently meant to let the rainwater drip clear of the frieze, architrave, and columns. A span roof then rises from the side cornices of the peristyle to a longitudinal central ridge ; and at each end a gable has been formed by two sloping cornices rising from eaves to ridge, and enclosing a triangle over the level cornice as a base, which triangle is filled in with stonework, following the alignment of the architrave and frieze below ; all this becoming a pediment. Then the roof has been formed, no doubt, in this way : heavy timbers rise from each side-cornice to the ridge at short intervals, resting on the walls of the cella in passing ; and—unless an opening for light should be left in the middle—the whole has been covered with stone slabs, or large tiles ; this covering being stopped at the ends against a thin additional course added above the sloping cornices of the pediments. Such, then, would be the primary motive of design which is suggested by the general forms of the edifice ; the rest is matter of detail. But we next observe that the stonework is finished with mouldings, and in ornamental design. The columns are circular on plan, and diminish slightly upwards to the top, where a thin, squared slab—the abacus—is interposed to form a bearing for the squared lintels ; the top of the cylindrical shaft, swelling out—in an echinus—to form



a bearing for the abacus. The architrave-course corresponds on the soffit with the size of the shafts below ; and it is finished at the upper line with a small projecting moulding. The frieze-course is ornamented in a manner not very easily understood at first. Over each column there is a slightly projecting tablet, of the full height of the frieze, and not so wide as high ; the feature being again repeated in the middle of the interspaces ; these projections are carved with vertical grooves in such a way as to be called triglyphs ; and the intervening spaces of the frieze—metopes—are square in shape, or nearly so, forming panels. Then the level cornice which runs along the sides or eaves, and also along the ends as bases to the pediments, is shaped sectionally in a still more complex way. A small crown moulding runs along the top line ; the soffit is sloped upwards from front to back to constitute the drip ; and over each of the triglyphs and metopes there is formed on the sloping soffit a sort of thin tablet—mutules. Lastly, there are carved under each triglyph, and on each of the soffit-tablets of the cornice, little buttons or drops—guttæ. The sloping cornices of the pediments are similarly moulded ; and the thin additional top course is made a moulding also. Now the elementary critical problem is contained in this simple question, upon which all our appreciation of the artistic merit of the design must turn : What, in the eye of the mason, will be the construction of all this masonry ? Let us try to discern this also. The top course of the stylobate is doubtless composed of large slabs, jointed under the centres of the shafts ; and the two under-courses will break joint to correspond. The columns are, of course, monoliths, and probably the capitals are included. The architrave-lintels are solid, and jointed over the centres of the columns. The cornice, no doubt, is similarly jointed. But what mean the triglyphs in the frieze ? They must be the ends of transverse stone lintels, which are laid from the architrave-course to the cella wall, carrying slabs over them, and so constituting a stone ceiling for the ambulatory. The square metopes between the triglyphs are then filled in, simply and very effectively, with sculptured panels. The pediments also are filled in with sculpture equally simply and effectively. But what mean the mutules and the guttæ ? Constructively, they have apparently no meaning at all ; but may they not nevertheless be legitimately decorative ? As we are fixing our attention upon the question of Living Art as distinguished from Lifeless, it must be at once asked whether, for instance, the guttæ are found, in fact, to facilitate the drip of water from the cornice soffit and from the architrave moulding. Probably no one would now seriously maintain such a notion ; and this admission may serve to introduce the theory of “the primitive hut,” a doctrine which at one time used to be very much relied upon to explain the features of the Greek Doric order—as the original of all the orders—by referring them to a supposed pre-historic practice of timber construction.

To state this theory very briefly, the cella was a log hut, the columns

were cut from trunks of trees, the abacus was a bearing-slab, the architrave was of squared logs, the frieze was formed by the ends of transverse beams with triglyphs cut naturally enough on the cross-grain, the mutules with their sloping soffits were the overhanging rafters, and the guttæ were an ornamental suggestion of water-drops; the mouldings and the rest being matter of ornamental detail. Upon the strength of all this it was argued—of course by those who had previously embraced the modern practice of counterfeit—that the Greek masonry was designed in mere imitation of such primitive timber-work. But—although it cannot be denied that there is a great deal to be said in favour of the general doctrine that the early mason, as matter of unconscious inheritance, would accept the forms of the earlier carpenter—this was such an obvious abandonment of the idea of Living Art, that it is now perhaps much better, for the sake of critical science as well as for the credit of the ancients, to let the primitive hut pass altogether, and adhere to the reading of stone construction alone, as above set forth.

If, then, we are still left to deal with the guttæ as we best can, on masonry principles, all we can say is that they are, like the mouldings and the triglyphs, only decorative, and perhaps one of the very simplest efforts of decorative-work. There seems to be no reason why we should object to the association of ideas turning upon the water-drops; but on the other hand, if the guttæ are taken to be only a stone fringe, and if the severe censor of "shams" pronounces them to be a "lifeless" ornament, this only raises a little sooner the question when and how the ornamental element is to be allowed to introduce itself in purely conventional forms.

Here the Ionic capital becomes a notable instance in point. The pseudo-academical idea that the volutes are derived from the great curls of a certain style of feminine *coiffure*, is infinitely worse criticism than the theory of the primitive hut. Perhaps it is best to regard the whole Ionic capital as a cushion-capital (although how to make it "living" in masonry it is still as difficult to see), derived as a pure conventionalism from the ruder precedents of Assyria, just as, by the way, the Doric itself is by many described to be a refinement on an Egyptian idea, of which we have at least one example still extant. If, again, we take the Corinthian capital, this has to be criticised on two lines; namely, as a development of the Egyptian foliated capitals, and as a contrivance *de novo*. In the former case the feature seems to be perfectly justifiable as an acceptable conventional inheritance, fairly adapted and exquisitely improved upon; in the other it is equally commendable—as also the Egyptian design would be—not regarded as a basket laid by chance on an acanthus root, but as a highly elaborated expansion of the summit of a stone column, to meet the form of the abacus by means of angular volutes supported by foliation at discretion. Upon this Corinthian capital, it may be remarked, the Romans, legitimately desiring to improve



the proportions of the ornamentation, engrafted, quite unnecessarily perhaps, but certainly with success superficially, the idea of the Ionic cushion in their Composite order. If we say they spoil the Corinthian critically, perhaps we might add that if they had rather modified the Greek Ionic itself in the direction of the Corinthian volute, the result might have been much more satisfactory in their hands. But there is one general observation in connection with these academical examples which ought to be made : it is not correct to say that the original antiques are living, and the modern reproductions lifeless. If a modern Classic colonnade follows the antique literally—"slavishly" is not a respectable term—this is a legitimate use of a much admired inheritance. The ancients, we may then be told, always varied their reproductions, and why should not we ? The answer is that the Cinquecentists did so. The French also have been perhaps still more successful in so doing.

This subject of Living Art *versus* Lifeless is, however, far too large, and indeed too recondite, for intimate investigation in these notes ; the reader may be asked to take what is above suggested as an example of one mode of illustration, but he must think the matter out for himself. The structural test—or ordeal of the structuresque—is much more easily applied, of course, to a modern building, than to the now conventional features of ancient detail, such as are above dealt with ; and the conclusions are much more palpable. But how to re-design any typical English subject of the day in a lifelike spirit structurally, without reverting to first principles in a way that is impracticable in actual work, is the serious question after all. The case of Gothic churches is scarcely in point ; they are more easily made structuresque, because their forms of structure are comparatively simple, especially internally. But take a theatre, a fashionable residence, or any of our ordinary municipal or commercial buildings of high class, and where would the architect begin or end ? Take the notable case of Street's design of the Law Courts, so "lifelike" under sentimental tests on paper, and so entirely dead and buried when judged by the practical ordeal of the coming and going of busy unsentimental people like lawyers in the actual edifice. At the same time true philosophy will affirm dogmatically, and will scarcely wait for an answer, first, that to speak of this nineteenth century generally as a lifeless or spiritless age, is so wholly absurd as to be almost an utterance of imbecility ; and secondly, and for that very reason, that to suppose there is not with us a current principle of the lifelike, which is to be clearly discovered and fairly applied, is equally absurd. Our iniquities, no doubt, are many, but the probability is that the mature verdict of posterity will not be so severe upon us as the hasty condemnation of some of ourselves. To carry enthusiasm too far is a very common mistake, and a very easy amusement ; and it is time that our youth should be invited to employ their critical powers a good deal more upon the discovery of what is good in the idiosyncrasy of their own generation,

and a little less in the more fascinating sport of persuading themselves to believe in the necessary superiority of the past.—Ed.]

## VII.—ETHNOGRAPHY.

It is not difficult to understand that when an art forsakes the real and natural path of development and follows only a conventional fashion, it must lose all ethnographic value, and that those circumstances which not only give such scientific value to the true styles of Art, but lend such an interest to their history, are almost entirely lost in speaking of the architectural styles of the Renaissance. It is this, indeed, which has done so much harm to the history of this art, and prevented it from taking its proper place as a branch of scientific research. A man who sees an Egyptian obelisk being erected in front of a Grecian portico in Portland cement, alongside of a new Norman parish church, to which they are attaching a schoolroom in Middle-Pointed Italian, and the whole surrounded by Chinese and Saracenic shop-fronts, is certainly justified in doubting whether there is really such a thing as the Ethnography of Architectural Art. It is necessary that he should have looked beyond the times of the Reformation, that he should be familiar with those styles which preceded it in Europe, or with those which are now practised in remote out-of-the-way corners of the world, before he can shake off the influence of this false school of teaching. Unfortunately it is only a few who have either the opportunity or the inclination to carry this through to its legitimate conclusion; hence the difficulty not only of restoring the art to the dignity of a science, but, more than this, the impossibility of making it a living and real form of artistic utterance.

If there is any Ethnography in modern Art it is this,—that during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries the Teutonic and more purely Aryan races assumed in Europe an importance and achieved a position which they had not before attained to. By that time the old artistic Turanian blood had either died out or been absorbed, and even the more imaginative Celtic races had lost that predominance which they had hitherto possessed; for from that hour the Celtic blood has been gradually becoming more and more mixed, or less and less prevailing.

The result of this may be a prevalence of mere matter-of-fact, common-sense ideas, better government, and more reasonable proceedings in all the arrangements of life; but, unfortunately, at the expense of all that poetry, all that real love of art, which adorns a more imaginative state of society. It is a fact that, wherever Teutonic or, as we call it, Anglo-Saxon influence has extended, freedom and wealth and all the accompanying well-being have followed in its train, but unadorned with those softer graces or poetic imaginings which it is sad to think have never yet co-existed with sober common sense.



Although therefore we must abandon, to a very considerable extent at least, all idea of tracing the ethnographic relation of nations by means of their Art in modern times, and though the study of modern Architecture consequently loses much of its value, still, on looking below the surface, we detect the existence of another class of phenomena almost as interesting to the philosophical student. This is the exhibition of the wonderful and enduring influence which education can exercise, not only on individuals, but on nations.

In the whole history of the world there is perhaps no such extraordinary instance of what education can do, as that of the state of Architecture since the beginning of the sixteenth century. At that time men forsook the principles on which this and all other cognate arts had been practised from the beginning of time; they forsook common sense and common prudence, not in the hope of attaining greater convenience or greater effect, more easily, or with less means, but in order to reproduce certain associations with which education had made them familiar. At one time it is Republican Greece, at another Imperial Rome, now it is the barbarous Middle Ages, none of which we have any immediate affinity for or relation with, but for which we are willing to sacrifice convenience and economy, and to spend absurd sums of money in reproducing what we know will be contemptible before it is half a century old, and what we feel is most inconvenient at the present hour.

As remarked above, something like this took place in literature a century ago, and, though we may now regret we do not blame it, because literature is a luxury. But Architecture is a necessary art. We can exist without poetry; we cannot live without houses and public buildings. What makes it more remarkable is that, while education has so far loosed her hold on literature that we now write poems and tell tales after our own fashion, and to please ourselves, without thinking of Classical or Mediæval models, we should still decorate buildings for no other purpose than to conjure up associations with which we have no relations except those derived through education.

#### VIII.—CONCLUSION.

The foregoing remarks will, it is hoped, be sufficient to show that the styles to be described in the following pages differ, not only in form, but more essentially in principle, from those which have hitherto occupied our attention, and that new principles of criticism and new laws of taste must be adopted in attempting to estimate their respective merits.

These, in fact, are so difficult that, whenever a question arises, most men shelter themselves under the maxim, "*De gustibus non est disputandum*;" a maxim which can have no possible application when

speaking of a true style of Art, but which comes painfully into play when we are called upon to estimate the products of individual talent, or to reprobate the indulgence of individual caprice.

When judged from their own point of view, we never can hesitate for a moment in estimating the relative value of any production of the Egyptian, the Classical, or Mediæval schools: their purposes are seen at a glance, and how far they succeeded or failed in attaining what they aimed at easily estimated: but when it is a question whether Egyptian or Classic or Gothic designs are to be adopted for modern English purposes, then indeed *de gustibus est disputandum*; or when we are called upon to appraise the relative merits of Wren or Inigo Jones, of Chambers or of Adams, of Pugin or of Barry, or to determine whether art has progressed or receded in the period that elapsed between the two first and the two last-named architects, all is not only perplexing and difficult, but most unsatisfactory in its result. But even this is not all. We have got to deal with an art which is not conducted on truthful or constructive principles, but on imitative attempts to reproduce something which has no real affinity with the building in hand; with an architecture which occupies itself almost exclusively with the meaner objects of domestic and civil wants, instead of the more elevated aims of Templar or Ecclesiastical buildings; with a style of building where the interior and the internal arrangements are almost everything, and the exterior, which is the true place for architectural display, may be anything, and consequently generally is a sham; with an art whose utterances, whether Classic or Gothic, are the products of the leisure of single minds, not always of the highest class, instead of with an art which is the result of the earnest thinking of thousands of minds, spread over hundreds of years, and acting in unison with the national voice which called it into existence; we are describing an art which is essentially Technic in all its forms, but which is now conducted on principles which are only applicable to the Phonetic arts—two classes as essentially distinct in their principles as any two arts can well be supposed to be.

All this is discouraging enough, but still it is our Art. It is that which covers all Europe, and adorns every city of the world, with its productions; and it cannot therefore be uninteresting to us as a psychological study, or as a manifestation of the mind of Europe during the period of its greatest cultivation and highest excitement. It is doubly interesting to try and master its meaning, and even to acquire a knowledge of its defects, for it is only by so doing that we can hope to avoid the errors of our forefathers; and if it should be possible that Architecture may again become a true and living utterance of the human mind, it is only by knowing what the art once was, what it now is, and the process by which it sank to its present position, that this result can possibly be attained.



There are so few symptoms of more correct ideas on this subject prevailing in the public mind, that any one may be considered as foolishly sanguine who hopes that Architecture may again be restored to the position of a truthful and real art ; but the object is so important that it is childish to despair, and wicked not to do what can be done to bring about an object in every respect so desirable.

[THE INDEFENSIBLE COUNTERFEIT AND ITS OVERTHROW :—Perhaps the chief point of modern European architectural discredit is the wholly indefensible sham-work properly so called. No doubt it had its origin, in this particular form, in the acceptance of the principles of imitation and copying, when the Cinquecentists reverted to the mode of the Romans. It eventually became, perhaps, most flagrantly and characteristically rampant in England—the home of the free and the brave—until America intervened with its still more unrestrained liberty and moral courage. It manifested itself from the first in two principal forms—disguised or counterfeited construction, and imitated materials. The materials we need not dwell upon ; when the plasterer is bidden to produce in surface cement the features of structural masonry, or the painter to make cast iron or putty ornament pass for oak carving, it is enough for the most generous criticism—which, by the way, is always the soundest—to say that the cement ought to have been differently applied in some characteristic way of its own, and that the art of imitating expensive materials ought to be kept within certain limits, perhaps in the abstract not easily definable, although clearly existent in the concrete. But when we contemplate the offence in the higher walks of the art—perhaps the very highest—which is committed by our own Wren, for example, in the dome of St. Paul's (compare the illustration No. 175 with St. Peter's, No. 30), to say nothing of the dome of St. Isaac's at St. Petersburg (No. 263) or the cast-iron dome-tower of the Capitol at Washington (No. 287), then we see what the greater architectural question of counterfeit design is, as a thing which is worthy of the most earnest study on the part of the artistic aspirant. The desire to make anything outside look like what it is not inside must be radically bad art in the nature of things. That the surface, or skin, should, as intimately as possible, concur, coincide, and correspond with the subcutaneous muscle and bone, is only one form of this simple proposition. Although the Cinquecentists, like the Romans, would have repudiated such a thing as a cast-iron colonnade permanently splashed like granite, or an entablature constructed of hollow lath and plaster to pass for stone (we may consent to ignore their occasional acts of marbling in paint, as an indication of the hope that the authentic material would be supplied in course of time), yet there can be no doubt that the best Italians of the day must have had their feeling for the true architecturesque considerably undermined when, as in the Rucellai Palace (No. 49), a thin cuticle of pilasters and entablatures was added

for the sake of "style" and nothing else to the simple honesty of such a house as the Riccardi Palace (No. 46); whilst the almost completely structuresque design of the Pesaro Palace (No. 55) ought, in its turn, to have similarly suffered to some extent by comparison with the arcades of the Hospital at Milan (No. 75), or those of the Borghese Palace (No. 64). But when Wren, in St. Paul's, was obliged to resort to such a device as the sham storey over the aisles, and when many whole interiors of grand churches, more or less like St. James's, Westminster (No. 180), and St. Martin's in the Fields (No. 187), are but the unmitigated lath and plaster delusions which we know them to be, how to justify such "fine-art" even the most lenient criticism must be at a loss to discover.

The mere simulation of Portland stone by a coating of Portland cement is infinitely excelled in stupidity by the acceptance of lath and plaster in such a way as to take the place of everything for a legitimate "finish." Fortunately, however, the days of such irrationality have in a great degree passed away; and it is to the revivalists of Gothic art in England, out of all the modern architects of the world, that the signal honour seems to be due of having initiated this revolt in favour of structural integrity. And that they have succeeded in accomplishing, in many cases, the best results attainable within their particular field, is unquestionable. A large amount of the element of artistic elegance they have had sometimes to surrender to archæological authenticity, and particularly, of course, in their more inexpensive work. In not a few instances they have even been led away by their enthusiasm for frankness and vigour to take delight in a certain *brusquerie* of design which is not to be called archaic, but coarse; a sort of Bohemianism which, in a refined age, can scarcely be regarded as an affectation that is harmless. But at the same time, if this be all the price we have had to pay for the success of Puginism, it must be cheerfully acknowledged that we ought to be well satisfied with the bargain.—ED.]

[THE EPISODE OF THE QUEEN ANNE STYLE :—The arguments adduced in favour of the legitimate character of the modern Italo-European style as the proper result of natural development, although they are obviously based upon the mere recognition scientifically of those claims of modern intelligence which it is idle affectation to deny, may in the opinion of some be at once challenged by pointing to the remarkable current fashion in England called "the Queen Anne style," which, it will be said, ought by this rule to be good Italian, but is only bad Dutch. Here again, however, the true critic will be careful to avoid a trap. Depend upon it, the adoption of this curious mannerism has been brought about by the systematic operation, whether for good or ill, of causes equivalent to the effect we see; there is nothing arbitrary, or even spasmodic, about the artistic progress of the multitude; it is only the individual, or the clique, that can be eccentric. What, then, is the true critical position of the Anglo-Dutch architecture of the passing



day? The answer is that it is an episode of South Kensington *bric-à-brac*; a temporary substitute for the "secular Gothic" which the ecclesiastical school tacked on to their proper province with such questionable success. Philosophically speaking, this fashion of the day, in the way in which we are actually developing it, is no doubt a return towards the modern European or Italian domestic mode, with a protest against the painstaking finish of that style, and in favour of the brusque and careless piquancy of the spurious domestic Gothic. "Quaintness" is its ideal—in other words, flippant picturesqueness—and the fact must not be forgotten that the movement was begun thirty years ago, and has been pursued ever since, not by the opponents, but by the adherents of the mediæval principle. We must also bear in mind that its originators, whenever they at that time gave expression to their purpose, professed no other object than the "revival" of a native English mode which they considered would be appropriate for present uses. Then the sketchers, wandering over north-western Europe for recreation in holiday tours, soon acquired such a collection of the more racy and characteristic illustrations of this mode, that the necessity or the obligation to rely upon English examples was superseded altogether; and accordingly the phrase "Flemish Renaissance" in place of "Queen Anne" is now at length being rationally accepted. The critic, of course, is entitled to say, and has said, What have we to do in England with Flemish Renaissance? The answer is that with Flemish Renaissance, in the Dutch sense of the term, or in the historical sense, we have nothing to do at all; but, regarding it as a temporary expedient for satisfying a craving after picturesqueness and quaintness, it has, nevertheless, come in conveniently for what it is worth—probably in history very little. What is to come out of it is another question; in itself it is, beyond all doubt, a mere stepping-stone.—Ed.]

[THE CULTIVATION OF PRINCIPLES OF CRITICISM.—At the present time, when the study of abstract principles of architectural composition has been in England quite suspended, and the common fashion of the day is simply to make things quaint or frisky enough, if possible, to surprise the passer-by; when the "masterly" sketch-books of the summer tourist are the accepted standards of taste, and severity and oddity run together in very loose harness; it would be useless to quote old maxims of design, for they are obsolete; and equally useless to suggest new ones, for the future must be left to evolve them. Gravity in architecture, and suavity, must return some day; we cannot be always so very lively on one side of the way, or for ever maintain such a frowning brow on the other; when the time comes the old maxims will come up again, and new ones will come with them; but we must wait. It would be useless, therefore, and only what is called old-fashioned, or even pedantic, to pretend just now to criticise by means of academical canons the artistic merits of current examples; the prodigious cultivation of the picturesque

has ruined criticism. The only thing, perhaps, that may be safely attempted for the present is the enforcement of broad precepts of obvious propriety. That every building ought to be most carefully devised and organised for the strict fulfilment of its purposes of occupation, is the very first point; and here the occupants must generally be allowed to be witnesses. This rule, moreover, will be found to reach a great deal farther than most of our artistic architects may suppose. The frank acceptance of such forms and features of conventional art as shall be perfectly appropriate, straightforwardly truthful, and unaffectedly graceful, may be relied upon as another rule; and especially that the common sense of the many should not be outraged by any uncounmonsense of the few. Intoxicated architecture may be always rejected; ambitious architecture may be at least regarded with suspicion; paper architecture is worthless—that in which the fascinating touch of the draughtsman is the chief or sole source of pleasure; quaint or funny architecture is almost invariably a delusion, concealing the architect's want of care, or want of genuine skill. Science never jests. On the other side of the question, however, we ought, even in this kind of criticism, to cherish liberality of feeling, and, if only as matter of expediency in such unfavourable circumstances, forbearance and modesty in delivering an adverse judgment. Who are the critics whose laugh has been the loudest in our day? Not the most learned students in the libraries; not the most able craftsmen in the studios. The pen of the ready writer in censorship, especially that of the amateur, is all too ready to run away with its master. The more we cultivate that generosity of judgment which pertains to elevated thought, the sooner our coming canons of taste will come. Error on the safe side in this particular matter is not reluctance to admire, but unwillingness to blame. Leaving out of account, of course, that which is unmistakably otherwise, let us always bear in mind that the work before us has cost its author pains, that his aim has been to please us, and that every blade of grass, however feeble, helps to make the swathe of hay.—Ed.]



## BOOK I.

## ITALY.

## CHAPTER I

ECCLESIASTICAL.<sup>1</sup>

I. CHURCHES ANTERIOR TO ST. PETER'S.—II. ST. PETER'S.—III. CHURCHES SUBSEQUENT TO ST. PETER'S.—IV. DOMICAL CHURCHES.—V. BASILICAN CHURCHES.—VI. EXTERIORS.—VII. INTERIORS.

## I.—CHURCHES ANTERIOR TO ST. PETER'S.

THE influence of the grand old style of Classical Art clung so tenaciously to the soil of Italy, that it would be extremely difficult to determine when the modern epoch really commenced, were it not for the two great tests enumerated above :—First, that all buildings of the modern styles are, or must at least attempt to be, copies of some more ancient building, or in some more ancient and obsolete style ; and, secondly, that they must be the production of one individual mind, and of that mind only.

Were it not for this, such buildings as San Miniato at Florence, and some of the basilicas at Rome, are in fact more Classical in plan, and—as their ornaments are generally borrowed from ancient buildings—far more so in detail, than many of the buildings of the Renaissance period. Their builders, however, were only thinking of how they might produce the best possible church for their purposes with the materials at their disposal, and not caring to glorify themselves by showing their own

<sup>1</sup> In the 'History of Architecture' Ecclesiastical Art is treated separately from Secular, and, as the principal and most important form, always took precedence of the other. The same course is pursued in this work in so far as Italy, Spain, and

France are concerned ; but, as the other countries hardly possessed an Ecclesiastical Art, properly so called, during the Renaissance period, it would be pedantic to follow out a division of the subject which has in effect no reality.

individual cleverness : we consequently study these agglomerations with nearly the same interest as we do a northern cathedral, and approach them with very different feelings from those which we experience in examining churches of more modern date.

It was, however, impossible that in a country which was everywhere strewn with specimens of ancient Art, and where the Classical spirit was more or less impressed on all such churches as then existed, the Italians could long escape from attempting to reproduce, exactly and intentionally, what they were repeating accidentally. Nor did they feel any regret at throwing on one side such traces of Mediaeval Architecture as they possessed, for the Pointed Style had never attained that degree of perfection which it reached on this side of the Alps, and had no real hold on the feelings of the people. Besides this, the Classical style was their own, invented in their country, suited to their climate and, to a certain extent, to their wants : so much so that whatever little inconvenience might arise from its adoption was more than compensated for by the memories which every detail called up, and to recall and rehabilitate these glories of their vanished greatness was the guiding idea of all the aspirations of that age.

This being so, it was an inevitable consequence that Classical Architecture should supersede Mediaeval in that country at some time or other ; and the occasion, as mentioned above, was when the revival of the literature of the Romans recalled the recollection of the greatest nation that Italy, and in some respects that the world, had ever seen. Sooner or later it must have come to this ; but practically the change was introduced by Filippo Brunelleschi<sup>1</sup> and Leon Battista Alberti,<sup>2</sup> two of the most remarkable men of their day.

The former, a Florentine by birth and an architect by inclination, early conceived the ambition of doming over the great octagon of the cathedral of his native city, which Arnolfo and Giotto had left unfinished, and, according to the usual practice of the Middle Ages, without even a drawing to show how they intended to complete it. They seem to have felt confident they could roof over even that space, and, if this confidence was justified, they wisely left the exact mode in which it should be done undetermined to the last moment, so as to benefit by all the study and all the experience that could be gained in the interval : for it must be remembered that in their age Architecture was a true and consequently a progressive art. Had it continued to be so, they were perfectly right in assuming that every year's experience in building would have indicated how the mechanical difficulties of the task could have been better overcome, and every day's additional study, or additional knowledge of architectural effects, would have shown how it could be done most artistically. They are not to blame that they could not


<sup>1</sup> Born 1377 ; died 1444.

<sup>2</sup> Born 1404 ; died 1472.



foresee the collapse that immediately afterwards took place, and which forced this art into the path where progress was impossible, and where their aspirations could never be fulfilled. Brunelleschi took it up at the dawn of a new era, in a totally different sense from that in which its original designers had left it ; but, convinced that it was the greatest opportunity for his purposes which his age presented, he pursued this object through life with a fire and energy which can only be realised by the hot blood of the South.

As mentioned in a former part of this work,<sup>1</sup> there is no great difficulty in seeing what Arnolfo intended to do with the great octagon, and as little doubt but that he would have been able to cover the space with a dome, somewhat similar internally to that executed by Brunelleschi, but externally either entirely hid by the roof or ornamented with three or four tiers of galleries, which would have counteracted any thrust, and



12. Plan of Santo Spirito, Florence. Scale 100 feet to 1 inch. From Agincourt.<sup>2</sup>


made its construction comparatively easy. It appears, however, that, in the beginning of the fifteenth century, a less expensive or a more Classical form of dome was demanded, but no one seemed to know exactly how to set about it. Under these circumstances Brunelleschi went to Rome, and studied with the most intense enthusiasm not only the dome of the Pantheon and all the other vaults which the Romans had left in that city, but, becoming enamoured of his subject, he mastered every detail of the style, and became familiar with every form of Roman Art.

In the year 1420 he returned to his native city, thoroughly a Classic in all that referred to Architecture : and not only did he, after innumerable complications, complete the great object of his life before he died in 1444, but he left his mark on the Architecture of his age.

<sup>1</sup> 'History of Architecture,' vol. ii. p. 209.

<sup>2</sup> 'Histoire de l'Art par les Monumens,' vi. vols. fol. Paris, 1823.

His first great undertaking in the new style was to complete the church of San Lorenzo, a large and important building in his native city, but which was considerably advanced when it fell into his hands. It is 260 ft. in length by 82 in width, with transepts 171 ft. from side to side. No church can be freer from bad taste than this one; and there is no false construction, nor anything to offend the most fastidious. Where it fails is in the want of sufficient solidity and mass in the supporting pillars and the pier-arches, with reference to the load they have to bear; and a consequent attenuation and poverty most fatal to architectural effect. This church, though very similar, is on the whole inferior in beauty to that of Santo Spirito, which being entirely according to Brunelleschi's design, he was enabled to mould it to his own fancies



13. Section of part of Church of Santo Spirito, Florence. Scale 30 feet to 1 inch. From Agincourt.

much more completely than he could the other. This church, too, is rather larger, being in plan (Woodcut No. 12) 296 ft. long by 94 ft. 3 in. wide, and, taking it all in all, is internally as successful an adaptation of the basilican type as that age presents. The design shows how complete a mastery its architect had obtained at Rome over that peculiar form of church, not usually prevalent in Italy, except at Rome and Ravenna, as well as over the details of the Classical style, which are here used with singular elegance and purity. What is perhaps principally to be objected to in the design is the fragment of the entablature which is placed on each column under the springing of the pier-arches (Woodcut No. 13), which in this church has not even the excuse it has in San Lorenzo, that it is repeated on the wall. It is, however, worthy of being remarked here as the earliest instance of the use of one of the



typical forms of the Renaissance, which is, taking it all in all, perhaps the most fatal gift of Classic Art to modern times, as nine-tenths of the difficulties and clumsinesses of the revived Art are owing to the introduction of this feature. The first thing the architects of the fifth and sixth centuries did was to abolish this fragment of an entablature, and place the arch direct on the pier or pillar, where it ought to be; and the advantage of this proceeding is so self-evident that it seems strange that it could ever have been restored. No single feature can more clearly mark the dawn of copying, to the exclusion of thought, than its reproduction.

Another of Brunelleschi's most admired works is the very elegant little octagonal church Degli Angeli, which, besides being so small as to




14. View of the Church of St. Francesco at Rimini. From Gally Knight's 'Italian Architecture.'

be insignificant, never was finished. There are several other churches by this architect which may have influenced the taste of his contemporaries, though they have added little to his personal fame.

Alberti was led to the study of Classical Art by a totally different path. Being nobly born, he received the best education that the country could afford, and became so enamoured of the literature of the Romans that he adopted Latin, not only as the language in which he wrote, but almost as that of his conversation; and having besides a taste for Art, and a mechanical turn of mind, he naturally turned his attention to the restoration of the Classical style. In order to forward this, he wrote a Latin treatise '*De Re Edificatoria*,' which is still a text-book on the subject, and practically he carried out some designs which, in so far as

least as the exteriors are concerned, were further in advance of his age than even those of Brunelleschi.

The best known and most admired of these is the church of San Francesco at Rimini (Woodcut No. 14), built for his friend Sigismondo Malatesta, who, besides wishing to erect a beautiful church, conceived the pathetic idea of making it a mausoleum for those friends he had gathered around him during his lifetime, and who he hoped might repose side by side with him after his death. It was in order to carry out this intention that the sides of the church were arranged as a series of grand



15. Plan of St. Andrea at Mantua. From Agincourt.  
Scale 100 feet to 1 inch.

niches, each of which was to contain a sarcophagus of Classical design. The façade was never finished, but is quite as elegant and as purely Classical as any of those afterwards erected by Palladio, and in some respects in better style; the whole being in good taste, and the parts combined together with great elegance and appropriateness, besides being free from any anomalies either of construction or detail.<sup>1</sup>

Alberti also erected the more important church of St. Andrea at Mantua, which, though hardly so elegant as that last mentioned, is even more interesting in an historical point of view, as being the type of all those churches which, from St. Peter's downwards, have been erected in Italy and in most parts of Europe during the last three centuries.

It differs, it is true, only in degree, either in plan or section, from the earlier Gothic churches; but the pilasters along each side of the nave, the coffered waggon vault, the form of the dome over the intersection of the nave and transept,<sup>2</sup> are all features which are for the first time fully developed in the positions in which we here find them, though we


<sup>1</sup> The interior was built before it fell into Alberti's hands, and is about as bad a specimen of the clumsy Gothic of the Italians as can well be conceived, and a perfect justification to those who rejected that style to adopt the Classical.

<sup>2</sup> It is said the dome was built afterwards. It may be so, but it was so evidently a part of the original design that whether erected then or not is of little consequence.



become so painfully familiar with them afterwards. In this instance, however, they are used with very great elegance, and combined with as much appropriateness as it is almost possible to conceive. The church being practically without side aisles, the pilasters, which are usually the great difficulty, appear to rest against the wall, and not as if they were applied to make up part of a pier, as is usually the case.

The dimensions of the church (Woodcut No. 15) are considerable, being 317 ft. long internally, and the nave and transepts are each



16. Section of St. Andrea, Mantua. From Agincourt. Scale 50 feet to 1 inch.

53 ft. wide by 95 in height, but owing to the simplicity of the parts it appears even larger than it really is. The great charm, however, is the beauty of its proportions, the extreme elegance of every part, and the appropriateness of the modes in which Classical details are used, without the least violence or straining. Most of the smaller ornaments have been painted on in quite recent times, so that it is not clear how many of them are parts of Alberti's original design; and their principal defect is that they are more secular than ecclesiastical in their character. This

does not destroy the effect of the architecture, though it detracts somewhat from their own appropriateness ; but, allowing for this defect, there is probably no church in Italy so entirely satisfactory as this ; and, considering the early date of this specimen, it is marvellous how Palladio and others could have gone so far astray with such an example before them.

The exterior never was finished except the entrance front (Woodcut No. 17), and that is worthy of the interior. Nothing in the style is grander than the great central arch, well supported on either side, and crowned by a simple unbroken pediment. The external order also ranges with the internal, and with the rowning member of the side aisles externally, so that there is no sham and no false construction : it is avowedly a porch, appropriate in style and dimensions to the church to which it is attached. There may be a little awkwardness in the side doors of the porch not being opposite to those leading into the nave, but the motive is so evident that it is not offensive.



17. Elevation of Porch of St. Andrea, Mantua.  
Scale 50 feet to 1 inch.

The church of St. Sebastian, also at Mantua, was erected by Alberti, but is by no means so happy in design, and in its present dilapidated condition cannot be quoted as a pleasing specimen of Art, though there are some features about it that mark the master mind.

Whether it was the special ability of these two men, or the circumstance of their applying their minds fresh from the study of the antique to the new form of Art, or from some other cause, it certainly happened that the new style was launched under singularly favourable circumstances ; and if it afterwards strayed further from the right path, it was not owing to the architects under whom it was inaugurated, but to circumstances which will be noted in the future.

Alberti died in 1472 ; consequently both these great revivalists were dead, and Gothic Art had perished in Italy some time before our Henry VII. ascended the throne, and more than half a century before the Pointed style ceased to be the only form of Architecture known or practised within these islands.

The next architect whose works had any marked influence on the progress of the new style was Bramante d'Urbino.<sup>1</sup> Born in the same year in which Brunelleschi died, he seems to have inherited not only his


<sup>1</sup> Born 1444 ; died 1514.



genius for the art, but the same impetuosity of disposition, and, by a curious coincidence, was the designer, and was nearly being the builder, of the only dome in the world which, for size and difficulty of execution, can rival that of his predecessor.

Though he was the architect of several secular buildings, which will be mentioned hereafter, the only church wholly by him which now exists, and which is recognised as remarkable, is that outside the walls at Lodi (shown in plan, section, and elevation, in Woodcuts Nos. 18, 19, 20). Though neither very large nor very elaborate in its decoration, it is a very beautiful church, and forms a perfect pendant to Alberti's church at Mantua; the one being the earliest and best type of the Basilican, as the other is of the Domical or Byzantine form of the Renaissance. When these two were finished the change from the Mediæval to the Modern style may be said to have been completed, and under the most favourable auspices. All that then remained to be done was gradually to invent new details to supply the place of the borrowed Classical ones, and a new and nobler style might have been invented. The opposite course was pursued; stereotyped forms only were tolerated, invention was discouraged, and the art decayed. This, however, was not the fault of the earlier architects, but of those who followed afterwards.


The church at Lodi consists of a dome, 50 ft. in diameter internally, and about three times that height. For external effect this is far from being too much; and although internally it certainly is too high in proportion, the defect is remedied, to a very great extent, by the introduction of four semi-domes, attached to the sides of the square supporting the central dome, and which make together an apartment 125 ft. wide by 150 in height. If these figures had been reversed it would have been better, but the proportion is so nearly good that the difference may be overlooked; especially when we observe to what an extent the Gothic style had introduced a taste for height as one of the principal elements of architectural grandeur. It may also be remarked that this building is more truthful in its construction than any Gothic building we are acquainted with, there being no false roof or false construction of any sort. The real defect of the design is that the ornamentation consists almost wholly of ranges of pilasters, which cover the walls both externally and internally, and by their small size and want of meaning detract much from what would otherwise be really a very beautiful design.



18. Plan of Church at Lodi. Scale  
100 feet to 1 inch.

Another very celebrated and more successful design of Bramante, or at all events of his age, is the dome he is said to have added to the

existing Gothic nave of Sta. Maria delle Grazie (Woodcut No. 21), at Milan, and which, both externally and internally, is one of the most pleasing specimens of its class found anywhere. Had the architects of the succeeding age been only content to work with the moderate amount of Classical feeling found in this building, we should have had no cause to regret the loss of the Gothic style; but the temptation to employ great pilasters and pillars, whose real recommendation was that they covered the greatest amount of space with the least amount of thought, was more than human nature could resist, on the part, at least, of men



19. Section of Church at Lodi. Scale 50 feet to 1 inch. From Agincourt.

who were more artists and amateurs than architects. Under the pretence that these forms were truly Classic, they soon became fashionable, and were never got rid of afterwards.

The dome of Sta. Maria is 65 ft. in diameter, to which are added three semicircular tribunes, smaller in proportion to the dome than those found at Lodi. Internally there are no exaggerated features to destroy the harmony of the parts, and the whole system of ornamentation employed is pleasing in detail, and appropriate to the situation where it is found, and only wants a little colour, which might now be applied, to give it a most pleasing effect. Externally, the square mass on which



the dome rests is hardly sufficiently relieved by the projection of the tribunes; though this is a far more pardonable defect than that which is found at St. Peter's, and generally in the Domical churches of the Renaissance, where the supports of the dome are so concealed by the body of the church as nowhere to be visible externally. In this instance the whole rises most pleasingly from the ground, and the ornamentation is everywhere truly constructive. Some of the details are overdone, and might have been simplified with advantage; but the whole is extremely elegant and satisfactory. The greatest defect of the design is perhaps



20. Elevation of Church at Lodi. Scale 50 feet to 1 inch. From Agincourt.

the crowning member. Either the circular form of the dome ought to have been shown externally, or the straight-lined roof carried forward over the arcade, so as to be perpendicular over the rest of the structure. As it is, the want of projection and shadow at this point breaks up the whole, and gives rise to an appearance of weakness, the effect of which is certainly displeasing.

There is another small circular chapel by the same architect in the cloister of San Pietro Montorio, at Rome. As its internal diameter is scarcely 15 ft., it can hardly be considered worthy of mention except as showing the taste of the designer, and how completely, in its circular

peristyle, he had caught the elegance of the Classical style ; but even then it is not equal either in taste or originality to his design at Lodi.

Perhaps, however, the most celebrated building of this age is the façade of the Certosa at Pavia ; and if we are content, as the Italians were, that the façade shall be only a frontispiece, suggesting rather than expressing the construction of the church behind it, this is certainly one of the most beautiful designs of the age. It was commenced in the year 1473, from designs prepared by Burgognone, a Milanese artist of some eminence at that time, but whose works in this instance at least show



21.

Santa Maria delle Grazie, Milan. From a Photograph.

how much more essentially he was a painter than an architect. They are thus interesting as an early instance of the danger of the practice of intrusting to men of the brush, works which can be executed properly by those who have all their lives been familiar with only the chisel and the trowel. The façade was not, however, completed till very long after his death, if, indeed, it can be said to be so even now, though the original design does not seem to have been ever departed from.

The façade consists of five compartments, divided vertically by buttresses of bold and appropriate form ; the three centre divisions




representing the body of the church, with its aisles, the outer one the side chapels of the nave. Horizontally it is crossed by two triforium galleries—if that name may be applied to them—one at the height of the roof of the aisles, the upper crowning the façade, and reproducing the gallery that runs round the older church under the eaves of the great roof. All these features are therefore appropriate and well placed, and give relief with light and shade to the composition, to an extent seldom found in this age. The greatest defect of the design as an architectural object is the amount of minute and inappropriate ornament which is spread over the whole of the lower part of the façade, up to the first gallery.

As mentioned in the Introduction, Painting was the art, *par excellence*, of the Renaissance age, and both Sculpture and Architecture suffered from her undue supremacy. Sculptured bassi-relievi were generally little more than pictures in relief, and Architectural ornaments were too often merely copies of painted arabesques. Those of this façade are identical with those with which Raphael was then adorning the Loggie of the Vatican; and however beautiful they may be as a painted decoration for an interior, they are singularly out of place and inappropriate as architectural ornaments on an exterior. In themselves, however, they are beautiful, and they captivate by their delicacy and the expression of elaboration which they convey from the infinite labour they so evidently must have cost; but beyond this they hardly add much either to the expression or to the beauty of the façade.

The erection of the cupola on the intersection of the nave and transepts of the Certosa was commenced and carried on simultaneously with that of the façade; and is not only a very beautiful object in itself, but is interesting as being the only important example of a Renaissance copy of the form of dome used by the Italians in the Mediæval period. An example of the Gothic form, as found at Chiavalle, was given in a previous part of this work.<sup>1</sup> The lower part of this design is quite as beautiful as that, if not more so; but it is overpowered by the cupola, which crowns the whole, and which was put there at a time when largeness of details was believed to contribute to grandeur of effect, though generally producing, as it does here, a diametrically opposite result. It is infinitely to be regretted that Brunelleschi did not translate Arnolfo's design into Classical forms, as was done in this instance, instead of trying to copy the simple but unsuitable outline of the Pantheon.

It would be tedious, as it would be uninteresting, to enumerate the other churches built in Italy during the fifteenth century. They are generally insignificant in size, as the piety of the Middle Ages had already endowed all the principal towns with churches sufficient for

<sup>1</sup> 'History of Architecture,' vol. ii. p. 208.



22. View of Western Facade of the Certosa, near Pavia. From Rosengarten.<sup>1</sup>

the wants of the inhabitants at that particular period. Their style was practically the same as that of those described above, but, being frequently built under the direction of men of less talent or less knowledge than the architects just named, they are generally inferior in design, halting painfully between the two styles, and, as is usually the case in such circumstances, selecting the defects rather than the beauties of either.

<sup>1</sup> 'Architektonischen Stylarten,' 8vo. Braunschweig, 1857.



Those just described—Santo Spirito at Florence, Sant' Andrea, Mantua, that at Lodi, and Santa Maria, Milan, with the façade of the Certosa at Pavia—may be taken as types of the churches of the true Cinque-cento period, and show how essentially, even at that early period, the Italian architects had got rid of all Gothic feeling, and how completely they had mastered that peculiar application of the Classical details to modern purposes which formed the staple of Architectural Art in Europe for the succeeding three centuries.

They also show how much more thought and care the traditions of Mediæval Art rendered it necessary that the architects at the dawn of a new age should devote to their designs, than the Painters and Sculptors who assumed the position of architects in the following centuries were either able or thought it incumbent on them to devote to the elaboration of buildings intrusted to their charge.

## II.—ST. PETER'S.


It will be perceived from the examples just quoted that all the elements of design which were afterwards found in the churches of the Renaissance had already been introduced during the fifteenth century, and that, if any great building of an ecclesiastical character were afterwards to be erected in Italy, we could easily predicate what form it would almost of necessity take.

An opportunity was not long wanting; for the old basilica of St. Peter's, built in haste, in a bad age, was fast falling to decay; and, notwithstanding that it was larger than any Mediæval cathedral, it still was felt to be unworthy of being the principal church of Europe. In consequence of this, Pope Nicholas V. commenced a new building, from the designs of Rossellini, on such a scale as would—had it been completed—have made it the greatest and most splendid cathedral of Europe, as essentially as the Pope was then the greatest high priest that the world had ever seen. His designs have not been preserved, and the only part which was executed was the western tribune, which occupied the same place as the present one, but was only raised a few feet out of the ground when the Pope died in 1454.

There the matter seems to have rested for more than half a century, and no one seems to have thought of carrying out the conception of Nicholas, till the project was revived, almost accidentally, by Pope Julius II. That pontiff, having commissioned Michael Angelo<sup>2</sup> to execute a splendid mausoleum to contain his ashes, on a scale so large that no church or hall then existing could receive it, bethought himself of the tribune of Nicholas as a fit and proper place for its erection.

<sup>1</sup> 'History of Architecture,' vol. i. p. 365, *et seq.*


<sup>2</sup> Born 1474; died 1563.



23. Plan of St. Peter's as proposed by Bramante. From Rotund.<sup>1</sup> No Scale.

<sup>1</sup> 'Numismata Summorum Pontificum Templi Vaticani fabricum indicantia,' fol. Romæ, 1715.





24. Plan of St. Peter's as proposed by Sangallo. From Bonanni. No scale.

Having once had his attention called to the subject, he not only determined to fit it up for this purpose, but to carry out the design of his predecessor, on a scale at least equal to the original conception.

Bramante, who was then in the plenitude of his practice and the zenith of his fame, was instructed to prepare the designs; and although we have not all the details requisite to form a judgment as to their merits, we may safely say that it is to be regretted they were not adhered to by subsequent architects.

The accompanying plan (Woodcut No. 23) will explain what he proposed. Beginning on the west,<sup>1</sup> with the tribune of Nicholas, he proposed to place in front of it, at a distance of 275 feet to its centre, a dome, equal in diameter, and similar in design, to that of the Pantheon, only that he proposed to surround it externally with a peristyle of pillars, and to surmount it by a lantern. This was to be the central point of three tribunes, the one already commenced, and two others north and south, at the extremities of the transepts; a disposition which has been adhered to by all subsequent architects, and now exists. To the eastward he proposed to add a nave 400 feet each way, divided into three aisles, and extending to five bays in length east and west. In front of this was to be a portico of thirty-six pillars, arranged in three rows, but unequally spaced. Another design of his, which we find commemorated in some medals, has two spires on this front, and between them a portico of only six pillars.

The foundation-stone of this great church was laid in the year 1506, and the works were carried on with the greatest activity during the following seven or eight years. On the death of Pope Julius II., in 1513, and that of his architect in the following year, the celebrated Raphael was appointed to succeed him. Although that great painter was an accomplished architect, in the sense in which that term was then becoming understood, the task he was now appointed to was as little suited to his taste as to his abilities. So great had been the haste of the late Pope, and so inconsiderate the zeal of his architect, that, though the great piers which were to support the dome had only been carried to such a height as to enable the arches to be turned which were to join them, they already showed signs of weakness, and it was evident they must either be rebuilt from the basement, or very considerably reinforced, if ever a dome was to be placed on them. While men were disputing what was best to be done, Raphael died, in 1520, and Baldassare Peruzzi<sup>2</sup> was appointed to succeed him as architect.

He, fearing that the work would never be completed on the scale originally designed, determined at once to abandon the nave of Bramante, and reduced the building to a square enclosing a Greek cross—to a design in fact similar to that of the church at Lodi (Woodcut No. 18)—only with the angles filled in with square sacristies, which were to be each surmounted by a dome of about one-third the diameter of the great one, being in fact the arrangement then and subsequently

<sup>1</sup> The orientation of St. Peter's is the reverse of that of northern cathedrals—the western apse containing the principal altar; but, as is well known, the practice of turning the altar in churches towards the east was never introduced into Italy.

<sup>2</sup> The centre of this dome was to coincide with the central point of the apse of the old cathedral, and the confessional beneath it was to be, and is, retained in this place at the present day.

<sup>3</sup> Born 1481; died 1536.





25. Elevation of East Front of St. Peter's according to Sangallo's design. From Bonanni. No scale.

so universal in the Russian churches. Before much was done, however, he died, in 1536, and was succeeded by the celebrated Antonio Sangallo.<sup>1</sup> He set to work carefully to re-study the whole design, and made a model of what he proposed, on a large scale. This still exists, and, with the drawings, enables us to understand exactly what he proposed; and although no part of it was executed, it is so remarkable that it deserves at least a passing notice.

He adopted in plan the Greek cross of Raphael and Peruzzi, which probably was too far advanced to be altered, but he added in front of it an immense pronaos, about 450 feet north and south, and 150 east and west, and consequently as large as most Mediæval cathedrals (Woodcut No. 24). This was the great defect in his design: for though it was beautiful and picturesque, and with its two steeples would have grouped pleasingly with the dome, still it was entirely useless. It did not add to the internal accommodation, like the nave of Bramante, and in fact was a

<sup>1</sup> Born 1470; died 1546

mere ornament, except for the one chamber over the entrance, from which the Pope's blessing was to be given.<sup>1</sup>

The principal merit of his design is the ordinance of the exterior (Woodcut No. 25). This consists of a Doric Order, representing the side aisles. Over this is an immense mezzanine, and over this again an Ionic order, with arches between. Although the façade is so broken up that these parts look a little confused as distributed there, nothing can be grander than the sweep round the tribunes. If he had had the courage to set back his upper Order to the inner side of the aisles, as shown in the diagram (Woodcut No. 26), and made it into a true clerestory, round the three circular apses and along the nave—thus giving his mezzanine a meaning, by making it represent the roof of the aisles on the angles and under the towers—he would have produced a design which it would have been difficult for even the Gothic enthusiasts of the present day to criticise. This would also have remedied what is



26. Diagram suggesting arrangement of aisles in Sangallo's elevation.

practically the principal defect of all these great domical churches; which is, that the dome seems to stand on, or be thrust through, the roof. Had the clerestory been thrown back here, the square base of the dome would have been in appearance brought down to the ground-line like a Gothic steeple on the intersection of the nave and transept of a Mediæval cathedral. The whole would then have risen, naturally and constructively, step by step, from the ground to the lantern on the top, and, with the simpler lines and more elegant details of Classic Art, a far more pure and majestic building would have been the result than any Gothic cathedral we have yet seen. If, in


addition to this, we take into consideration that the section of the clerestory was intended to have been at least 150 feet from side to side, while that of Cologne is only one-third of that dimension, and that the intersection would have been crowned by a dome of such dimensions that the central tower of Cologne would hardly be big enough to be its lantern, it may easily be conceived how nearly all the elements of architectural sublimity were being reached.

It does not appear that much was done towards carrying out this design. All Sangallo's time, and all the funds he could command, were employed in strengthening the piers of the great dome, and in remedying the defects in construction introduced by his predecessors. His design, besides, does not seem to have met with much favour among his contemporaries, and with the greatest opposition from Michael Angelo, whose criticism was "that it was broken into too many parts, and with

<sup>1</sup> It is more than usually interesting to us, as will be shown hereafter; inasmuch as this pronos was the feature which Sir

C. Wren selected principally for imitation in his own first and favourite design for St. Paul's.





27. Plan of St. Peter's as it now exists. Scale 100 ft. to 1 inch. With Plan of old Basilica in outline.

an infinity of columns would convey the idea of a Gothic building rather than of an antique or Classical one ;"<sup>1</sup> a remark that conveys only too exactly the feelings of that age, though it would hardly be considered its worst condemnation at the present day, nor does it appear justified by a study of the design.

At Sangallo's death, in 1546, the control of the works fell into the hands of Michael Angelo ; and although he did not and could not alter either the plan or general arrangement of his predecessors to any material extent, he determined at once to restrict the church to the form of a Greek cross, as proposed by Peruzzi and Raphael, and he left everywhere the impress of his giant hand upon it. It is to him that we owe certainly the form of the dome, and probably the ordinance of the whole of the exterior.

In spite of intrigues and changes in the administration, this great man persevered in an undertaking in which his heart and his honour were engaged ; and at his death, in 1563, had, like Brunelleschi his great predecessor in dome-building, the satisfaction of seeing his dome practically completed ; and he left so complete a model of the lantern, which was all that remained unfinished, that it was afterwards completed exactly as he had designed it. The only part of his design which he left unfinished was the eastern portico. This he proposed should be a portico of ten pillars standing free, about one diameter distant from the front of the façade, and four pillars in the centre, the same distance in front of these. There would have been great difficulty in constructing such a portico with an "Order" exceeding 100 ft. in height ; and it is feared it would have lost much of its dignity by the wall against which it was to be placed being cut up, by niches and windows, to the extent to which Michael Angelo proposed should be done. Fontana,<sup>2</sup> after his death, proposed to reduce the back range of pillars to eight, leaving the front four ; and made some other alterations which were far from improvements. Nothing was done to carry out either design, and during the pontificate of Paul V. it was suggested that the portico should be carried forward to where the front now is, and a nave inserted between them, restoring the building to the form of a Latin cross, as originally suggested by Bramante.

This idea was finally carried into effect by Carlo Maderno,<sup>3</sup> a very second-class architect, in the beginning of the seventeenth century, only that he was afraid to attempt a portico of free-standing columns, and plastered his against the wall, as they now stand. The annexed plan (Woodcut No. 27) represents the building as it now exists. The work of Maderno is distinguished by a different tint from that of Michael Angelo ; and the plan of the whole Basilica is also shown in outline,

<sup>1</sup> Milizia, 'Vita di Antonio Sangallo.'

<sup>2</sup> Born 1543; died 1607.

<sup>3</sup> Born 1556; died 1629.





28. Elevation of the Western Apse of St. Peter's. Scale 100 feet to 1 inch, or half the usual scale for elevations.

in order that their relative dimensions and positions may be understood.

About the year 1661 Bernini<sup>1</sup> added the piazza, with its circular porticoes and fountains, thus completing, as we now see it, a building which had been commenced more than a century and a half before that time, and which, with all its faults, is not only the largest but the most magnificent temple ever raised by Christians in honour of their religion : and was only prevented from being the most beautiful by the inherent vices of the school in which it was designed.

It would be difficult, in modern times, to find names more illustrious than those who were successively employed to carry out this

<sup>1</sup> Born 1598; died 1680.



29.

East Front of St. Peter's. From a Photograph.

design. Money was supplied without stint, and all Europe was interested in its completion. The best of building-stones were available on the spot, and the most precious marbles were employed in its decoration. Painting, sculpture, mosaics, whatever could add to its richness or illustrate its uses, were all supplied by the best artists, and now exist in more profusion than in any other church; yet, with all this, St. Peter's is a failure, and has not even a single defender among the architectural critics of Europe.

Externally, the triapsal arrangement of three great tribunes at the west end, accentuated by square masses between in the angles, and surmounted by such a dome as that of St. Peter's, ought to be the most beautiful that can well be conceived; but its effect is dreadfully marred by the only ornament being a gigantic Order of Corinthian pilasters, 108 ft. in height from the base to the top of the cornice, and surmounted by an attic of 39 ft., and with a podium or basement of



15 ft., making up a wall 162 ft. in height (Woodcut No. 28). These Corinthian pilasters, spaced irregularly, are repeated all round the church, without even being varied by becoming three-quarter columns, except in the eastern façade, which cannot be seen in conjunction with the rest of the church. They are consequently unmeaning to the last degree. A Doric or Ionic pilaster is never so offensive: the capital is so unimportant in these that the pilaster becomes a mere panelling or buttress to the wall; but the great acanthus-leaves of the Corinthian order, nearly 7 ft. in height, challenge attention everywhere; and when it is found that they have really no work to do, and are mere useless ornament, our sense of propriety is offended. Between these pilasters there are always at least two storeys of windows, the dressings of which are generally in the most obtrusive and worst taste; and there is still a third storey in the attic, all which added together make us feel much more inclined to think that the architect has been designing a palace of several storeys on a gigantic scale, and trying to give it dignity by making it look like a temple, rather than that what we see before us is really a great basilican hall degraded by the adoption of palatial architecture. We know in fact that there is falsehood somewhere, and are at a loss to know in which direction it lies, or by what standard of taste to judge the culprit.

In itself the dome is a very beautiful structure, both internally and externally: taking it altogether, perhaps the very best that has yet been constructed. Externally, its effect is in a great measure lost, from its being placed in the centre of a great flat roof, so that its lower part can nowhere be properly seen except at a distance; and it nowhere groups symmetrically with the rest of the architecture (Woodcut No. 29). The lengthening of the nave has added to this defect, but hardly to any considerable extent, as the ground falls too rapidly towards the Tiber to have allowed its base ever to be seen in front; and cutting the Gordian knot by hiding it altogether was perhaps the best thing that could have been done.

It is the same defect of the introduction of an order in every respect disproportioned to the size of the interior that destroys the proportions of the whole. An order 100 ft. in height is by no means excessive under a dome 333 ft. high internally; and consequently the temptation to use it in the particular position was so obvious, that, if the interior was to be Classical, it was almost impossible to resist it; besides, it was there in perfect proportion. When, however, the same order came to be carried round all the tribunes, and down the nave, where the whole height was only 143 ft., the disproportion became apparent, and not only dwarfed everything near it, but necessitated the exaggeration of every detail and every ornament, to such an extent as to give an air of coarseness and vulgarity to the whole, to an extent hardly to be found in any other Renaissance building.

It is probable that the introduction of this gigantic order in the interior is due to Bramante, as it was adopted by Sangallo, who, from his treatment of the exterior, could not have approved of it. Had the former carried it out, it is evident from his plan that he would have corrected its defects very considerably. Instead of the four great arches, each 40 ft. wide, with his monster pilasters between each, with which Maderno disfigured the nave, Bramante proposed five arches with slighter piers, and might have introduced six with good effect. A Gothic architect would have employed nine or ten in the same space, and a Classic architect sixteen or eighteen pillars. This last was, in fact, the only mode by which the whole interior could be brought into harmony and good taste; but the difficulties of their employment were so great that we are hardly surprised that the architect shrunk from the attempt to introduce them. In the first place, the stone used for the exterior—which was the best available—is so coarse-grained as to be wholly unsuited for internal purposes, and must, if thus used, have been covered with plaster and painted in imitation of marble or some other material. No marble or stone capable of receiving a polish was available in such masses as were required for pillars nearly 10 ft. in diameter. It is true that, if fluted and covered with a fine coating of plaster, mere gilding, with a slight tint of colour, would have been both in good taste and appropriate, though wanting in that grandeur which the employment of a true and precious material alone can convey.<sup>1</sup>

Supposing this difficulty of material got over, those of construction were still greater. It would have required immense blocks of stone to form the entablature, and these must have been fitted with great skill and nicety to obtain the solidity requisite to support the vault, and they would even then hardly lend any assistance to the piers of the great dome. These, it is true, are so massive they ought not to require it; but the painters who erected the church were such bad architects that the temptation could not be resisted to employ arches to abut the piers and give them that stability which their slovenly construction made necessary.

It was, in all probability, these constructive difficulties that forced on the architects of St. Peter's the present inartistic arrangements of the interior; but the one thing that would have given meaning to the pilasters now existing about the piers of the dome, where they are perfectly in place, would have been to suggest that they were the reflex of pillars that were doing the work elsewhere. Besides this, the perspective through a forest of sixty-four, or rather ninety-six, great Corinthian pillars—two or three rows of sixteen on each side of the nave—80 ft. high, must have been the finest thing attempted

<sup>1</sup> The present pilasters under the dome and all round the interior of the church are built in rubble plastered, and coarsely painted in imitation of marble.




since the Great Palace at Karnac, and might have surpassed in beauty and grandeur even that majestic hall.

The vaults themselves are of great beauty, and free from most of the defects of the architecture that supports them, and so is the interior of the dome, except that it is so lofty that it dwarfs the rest, and it is painful to look up at it. Had it sprung from a little above the main cornice of the pendentives, it would have looked much larger in itself, and have increased the apparent vastness of the church to a very considerable extent.

Another difficulty arising from the gigantic size of the internal Order as now used is, that it required a corresponding exaggeration in every detail of the church. The Baldacchino, for instance, over the altar, rises to 100 ft. in height, and has an Order 62 ft. high; but with even these dimensions it is hardly tall enough for its situation. But it is even worse with the sculptured details. The figures that fill the spandrels of the pier arches throughout the church would, if standing upright, be 20 ft. in height. The first impression they produce on looking at them is, that they are little more than life-size; and the scale they consequently give to the building is that it is less than half the size it really is. When the mind has grasped their real dimensions, this feeling is succeeded by one almost of terror, lest they should fall out of their places, the support seems so inadequate to such masses; and, what is worse, by that painful sense of vulgarity which is the inevitable result of all such exaggerations. The excessive dimension given to the Order internally is, in fact, the keynote to all the defects which are now noticed in the interior of this church, and these are not redeemed by the dignity that would have been given to the interior had the order been used as a true columnar order in any part of the church.

No church in Europe possesses so noble an atrium as is formed by the great semicircular colonnades which Bernini added in front of St. Peter's. These are 650 ft. across; but their effect is very much marred by their being joined to the church by two galleries, 306 ft. long, sloping outwards as they approach the church. These last are in consequence scarcely seen in the first approach, so that the colonnades appear to be in contact with the church itself, and its size is diminished by the apparent juxtaposition, without the device adding to the dimensions of the Order of the atrium. Had they been made to slope inwards, there would have been a false perspective that would have added considerably to the optical dimensions of both: but either would have been wrong, as all theatrical tricks are in true architecture. The only true plan was to make them parallel to one another, and at right angles to the church, when each part would have taken its proper place, and each appeared in its true relative dimensions.

From whatever point of view we regard it, the study of St. Peter's



30.

Section of St. Peter's. Reduced from Bonanni by Rosengarten.

is one of the saddest, but at the same time one of the most instructive, examples in the whole history of Architecture. It is sad to think the world's greatest opportunity should have been so thrown away, because this building happened to be undertaken at a time when Architecture was in a state of transition, and when painters and amateurs were allowed to try experiments in an art of which they had not acquired



the simplest rudiments and did not comprehend the most elementary principles. Had such an opportunity fallen to the lot of the ancient Egyptians, its dimensions would have secured it a greater sublimity than is found even at Karnac. If Greece could have been allowed to build on such a scale, the world would have been satisfied for ever afterwards ; and even in India, so large a building must have been exquisitely beautiful. Had it been intrusted to any dozen master masons in the Middle Ages—to men it may be who could neither read nor write—they would have produced a building with which it would have been difficult to find fault ; but here, all the talent, all the wealth of the world have been lavished, only to produce a building whose defects are apparent to every eye, and which challenges our admiration principally from its size and the richness of its ornamentation. The result has been a building which pretends to be Classical, but which is essentially Gothic. It parades everywhere its Classical details, but the mode in which they are applied is so essentially Mediæval, that nobody is deceived. We have two antagonistic principles warring for the mastery—the one Christian and real, the other sentimental and false ; and, in spite of all the talent bestowed upon it, it must be admitted that the result is a failure. It is a failure, in the first place, because its details are all designed on so gigantic a scale as to dwarf the building, and prevent its real dimensions ever being appreciated. It fails even more because these details are not, except under the dome, even apparently constructive. In almost every part, they are seen to be merely applied for the sake of ornament, and more often to conceal than to accentuate the true construction. The pilasters, both externally and internally, though the leading features, seldom accord—never on the exterior—with the tiers of windows or niches between them ; and the unmeaning attic that crowns the Order is in itself sufficient, in a church, to throw the whole out of keeping. Nowhere, in fact, except in the dome and the vaults, is there truth of either construction or ornamentation ; and these elements, in consequence, interfere with one another, to an extent which is probably more striking here than it is elsewhere, from the scale on which it is carried out, but is in reality as fatal to other buildings, which will be alluded to hereafter.

Notwithstanding all this, there is a simplicity and grandeur about the great vault of the nave, which goes far to redeem the bad taste of the arches which support it ; and the four great vaults of the nave, transepts, and choir, each 80 ft. in span and 150 ft. in height, opening into a dome of the dimensions and beauty of proportion of that of St. Peter's form together one of the most sublime architectural conceptions that the world has yet seen. There is a poetry, too, in the ever-varying perspective that is afforded by the intersections of the great vaults with those of the aisles that surround the piers of the dome, that is unrivalled by any similar effect in any other church in Europe.

Each of these aisles is 400 ft. in length, and 50 ft. in width, and 75 in height, each quadrant, in fact, equal in dimension to those of the nave of a Gothic cathedral, and with more pleasing proportions. These, with the dome and naves, open up vistas unsurpassed for beauty and variety by those of anywhere else. Had the church been restricted to the Greek cross, as Michael Angelo wished it to be, we would not have been offended by the faults of the nave, and its interior might have been considered architecturally, as well as from its richness and dimensions, worthy of being the principal temple of the Christian religion. The truth is that, in spite of all its errors in detail, St. Peter's possesses in a pre-eminent degree two of the principal elements of architectural grandeur, and these to such an extent as to have rendered a failure, internally at least, very difficult. Externally the size of the pilasters and the disposition of the parts is such as to detract most painfully from the real dimensions, but it is impossible to enter the interior without being awe-struck at the vastness of the area which is unapproached by that of any stone building in the world; while at the same time the mind is perfectly satisfied with the more than sufficient stability of the whole. The great piers of the dome are practically solid towers of masonry sixty feet square,<sup>1</sup> and look as if they could support ten times the mass placed upon them; and all the other parts display an equal superfluity of strength. With such dimensions as the interior of St. Peter's possesses, and such massiveness aided by a pleasing proportion of the parts among themselves, it would have been difficult to design any details that would destroy the unrivalled grandeur of its effect. It thus happens that in spite of all its faults of detail, the interior of St. Peter's approaches more nearly to the sublime in architectural effect than any other which the hand of man has executed. Its one rival is the Hall at Karnac; but, except in propriety of detail, even that must yield the palm to the Roman basilica. St. Sophia at Constantinople is more beautiful in many respects, but it has neither the dimensions nor the massiveness which are required to compete with St. Peter's in sublimity of effect.

[IS ST. PETER'S "A FAILURE"? Some of the author's criticisms of this *chef d'œuvre* of the Renaissance may surely be acknowledged to be inadvertently wanting in respect for extraordinary effort. There have been certain undertakings, from the Tower of Babel downwards,

---

<sup>1</sup> The piers that support the spire at Salisbury, a building nearly equal in height to St. Peter's, and more massively constructed, are only 6 feet square in the solid, and with the attached shafts only 8 feet, so that in proportion to the piers at St. Peter's, they are only as 1 to 100 or one hundredth part of their mass. The

disproportion may be excessive, but in the one case the mind is forcibly, but pleasingly, impressed with the apparent eternity of the mass; in the other it is impossible to avoid a most unsatisfactory feeling of insecurity from the too apparent frailty of the structure. The one may be sublime, the other can only be characterised as clever.



in which vaulting ambition has o'erleaped the saddle, for the simple reason that man with all his ambition cannot add a cubit to his stature—except by getting on stilts and probably stumbling. Whether he is baking bread or governing an empire, whether threading a needle or building St. Peter's, a man is a thing from five to six feet long, and his days are few and full of trouble. By no means unfrequently he spoils the loaf, and misses the needle's eye; he is invariably considered to govern the empire badly—that is to say, not so well as his critic would have done it; and, when he builds St. Peter's, of course he "fails." But is not failure glorified by the attempt? *Humanum est errare*; humanity and "failure" have run together ever since the world began. Think of this thing five and a half feet long, and of what it has the courage to try to do! Better, surely, to have tried and "failed," than never to have tried at all!

The merits of St. Peter's turn upon the prodigious majesty of the conception. Those who look at it now are still beings of the same diminutive size that has been specified; and if their swelling imagination sometimes forgets this circumstance, they ought to be reminded of it. In modern architectural drawings it is a very good custom to represent the human figure holding up a ten-foot rod as a reminder of the scale; let us suppose the vergers in St. Peter's to be instructed to carry some corresponding instrument of admonition. The well-worn incident at the Egyptian banquet, where the slave warns Pharaoh that he is mortal, might serve also to warn the observant British tourist in St. Peter's that the "failure," the "air of coarseness and vulgarity," the "exaggeration of every detail," and so forth, are but the simple elements of that particular form in which the inevitable "*errare*" must check the moral courage of mankind, when they gird up their little loins for a very big thing. The big pulls away from the beautiful, and there must be a compromise. Therefore let the reader not forget to put as much emphasis upon our shrewd and outspoken author's praise of St. Peter's as upon his dispraise, and perhaps a little more. Criticism of the detail aesthetically is an exercise for the student's individual judgment; and its success will depend upon his personal competency; the great basilica is not a fit object-lesson for beginners; forcible feebleness, it must also be remembered, is an accusation very commonly brought against the artistic work of the sunny south, by critics from the north; but what our author says at the end of his observations he says well:—"In spite of all its faults of detail, the interior of St. Peter's approaches more nearly to the sublime in architectural effect than any other which the hand of man has executed."—ED.]

## III.—CHURCHES SUBSEQUENT TO ST. PETER'S.

The church of San Giovanni Laterano ranks next in importance to St. Peter's among the churches of Rome; and next in size, if we omit the old basilica of St. Paul's, burnt down in 1823. Having been erected as lately as the tenth century, as a five-aisled basilica, it does not seem to have been in so decayed a state as to necessitate its being entirely



21.

View of the lateral Porch of San Giovanni Laterano. From Letareouilly.<sup>1</sup>

rebuilt, as was the case with St. Peter's; but it has been so encrusted with modern additions, that it requires the keen eye of an antiquary to detect the ancient framework that underlies the modern accretions.

The first important addition that was made was that of a portico to the northern transept, by Domenico Fontana,<sup>2</sup> in 1586 (Woodcut No. 31). It consists of five arcades of the Doric order below, surmounted

<sup>1</sup> 'Édifices de Rome Moderne,' fol. Paris, 1810.

<sup>2</sup> Born 1543; died 1607.



by a similar series of the Corinthian order above. There is nothing either striking or original in the design, being a mere modification of the arrangements of the old amphitheatre; but it is elegant and in good taste; and, if we are prepared to forego all evidence of thought, or anything to mark the feelings of the age, there is no fault to find with it. Its proportions are good, its details elegant, and its design



32 Principal Façade of the Church of San Giovanni Laterano. From Letarouilly.

appropriate to the purposes to which it is applied. In an age which was enamoured with Classical forms, it must have appeared a type of High Art. Even if its architect was not as enthusiastic a Revivalist as his employers, he must at all events have been content with the amount of fame he attained with so little expenditure of thought. Though this porch may not exhibit the highest quality of design, its architect deserves great credit, considering the age in which he lived, for introducing no more instances of bad taste than it displays,

and adhering so strictly to the Classical forms he was trying to emulate.

The principal front of the church retained its primitive simplicity for more than a century and a half after that time, when the present façade was added to it by Alessandro Galilei<sup>1</sup> in 1734 (Woodcut No. 32); and, considering the age when it was built, it too must be considered a model of good taste and propriety, more especially if we look inside the church and see with what frightfully bad taste it had been disfigured by Borromini in 1660. That probably was the worst period of Roman Art, and it was with something like a return to a more correct appreciation of the Classic styles that Galilei's façade was designed. It was no doubt a mistake to place the principal Order on such high pedestals; and the usual excuse for this arrangement was wanting here; for the secondary Order is so small as to be merely an ornament to the windows and openings, and does not compete in any way with the main features. The balustrade on the top is too high, and the figures it supports too large; but it is, on the whole, a picturesque and imposing piece of architectural decoration, with more ingenuity and more feeling than almost any other Italian design of its age; and, considering that it was essential that there should be an upper gallery, from which the Pope might deliver his blessing, some of its defects could with difficulty have been avoided.

The same architect designed the Corsini Chapel attached to this church; and, though a little overdone in ornament, the design is well understood and appropriate, and is in singularly good taste and elegant, when viewed in conjunction with the capricious interior of the church to which it is attached.

#### IV.—DOMICAL CHURCHES.

The admiration excited by the great domical creations of Bramelleschi and Michael Angelo fixed that form as the fashionable one in Italy; and no great church was afterwards erected in which the dome does not form a prominent feature in the design. In some instances the dome or domes were the church.


One of the best known examples of this is the Santa Maria della Salute, on the Grand Canal at Venice, built by Baldassare Longhena<sup>2</sup> in 1632, according to a decree of the Senate, as a votive offering to the Virgin for having stayed the plague which devastated the city in 1630. Considering the age in which it was erected, it is singularly pure, and it is well adapted to its site, showing its principal façade to the Grand Canal, while its two domes and two bell-towers group most pleasingly in every point of view from which Venice can be entered on that side. Externally it is open to the criticism of being rather over-

<sup>1</sup> Born 1691; died 1737.

<sup>2</sup> Born 1602; died 1682.



loaded with decoration; but there is very little of even this that is unmeaning, or put there merely for the sake of ornament. Though it certainly is a defect, yet, taking it altogether there are few buildings of its class in Italy whose exterior is so satisfactory as this one is. Internally the great dome is only 65 ft. in diameter, but it is surrounded by an aisle, or rather by eight side chapels opening into it through the eight great pier arches: making the whole floor of this, which is practically the nave of the church, 107 ft. in diameter. One of these side chapels is magnified into a dome, 42 ft. in diameter, with two semi-domes, forming the choir, and beyond this is a small square chapel; an arrangement which is altogether faulty and very unpleasing. As you enter the main door, the great arches of the dome being all equal to one another, no one of them indicates the position of the choir; and in moving about, it requires some time to discover where the entrance and where the sanctuary are placed. Besides this, going from a larger dome to a smaller—



33. Plan of the Church della Salute at Venice.  
Scale 100 ft. to 1 in. From Colognara.

from greater splendour to less—ought always to be avoided. In fact, if the church were turned round, and the altar placed where the entrance is, it would be a far more satisfactory building. As it is, neither the beauty of the material of which it is built, nor the elegance of its details, can redeem the radical defects of its internal design, which destroy what otherwise might be considered a very beautiful church.

The church of San Simone Minore, also in the Grand Canal, is a building very similar in plan, but open to exactly the opposite criticism of being too simple. The church itself, as seen from the canal, is a plain circular mass, surmounted by an enormous dome 56 ft. in diameter internally, which utterly crushes what is one of the most beautiful Corinthian porticoes of this or any other modern building. It is harmonious in proportion, and singularly bold in its features, from the strength of the square pillars that support its angles; while generally a beauty of detail and arrangement characterises every part of its design.

As an example how bad it is possible for a design of this sort to be without having any faults which it is easy to lay hold of, we may take the much-praised church of the Carignano at Genoa. It was built by Galeazzo Alessi,<sup>1</sup> one of the most celebrated architects of Italy, the friend

<sup>1</sup> Born 1500; died 1572.



24. View of the Dogana and Church della Salute, Venice. From Canaletti.

of Michael Angelo and Sangallo, and the architect to whom Genoa owes its architectural splendour, as much as Vicenza owes hers to Palladio, or the City of London to Wren.

The church is not large, being only 165 ft. square, and the dome 46 ft. in internal diameter. It has four towers at the four angles, and, when seen at a distance, these five principal features of the roof group pleasingly together. But the great window in the tympanum, and the two smaller semicircular windows on each side, are most displeasing; neither of them has any real connexion with the design, and yet they are the principal features of the whole; and the prominence given to pilasters and panels instead is most unmeaning. If we add to this that the details are all of the coarsest and vulgarest kind, the materials plaster and bad stone, and the colours introduced crude and inharmonious, it will be understood how low architectural taste had sunk when and where it was built. The strange thing is, that critics at





33. Elevation of principal Facade of the Church of Carignano at Genoa. From Gauthier.<sup>1</sup>

the present day should be content to repeat praise which, though excusable at the time it was erected, is intolerable when the principles of the art are better understood ; for it would be difficult in all Italy, or indeed in any other country, to find a church so utterly devoid of beauty, either in design or in detail, as this one is. Its situation, it is true, is very grand, and it groups in consequence well with the city it crowns ; but all this only makes more apparent the fault of the architect, who misapplied so grand an opportunity in so discreditable a manner.

One of the least objectionable domical churches of Italy is the Superga, near Turin, built by Ivrea, in fulfilment of a vow made by Victor Amadeus at the siege of Turin, in 1706. Its dome is little more than 60 ft. in diameter, resting on an octagon, with a boldly projecting portico of four Corinthian columns in front over the entrance, and is joined to a cloister behind. This is very cleverly arranged, so as to give size and importance to what otherwise would be a small

<sup>1</sup> 'Les plus beaux Edifices de la Ville de Gènes,' fol. Paris, 1818-1831.

church ; but in doing this the church and the convent are so mixed up together that it is difficult to tell where one begins and the other ends ; and, as is too frequently the case with these buildings, the falsehood is so apparent that both parts suffer.

One of the last, though it must also be confessed one of the very worst, examples of a domical church in Italy, is that of San Carlo at Milan, the foundation of which was laid as lately as 1838. The architect of the building was the same Amati who so strangely disfigured the façade of the cathedral of the same city in Napoleon's time. The building deserves the careful study of every architect, inasmuch as, copying the best models, using the correctest details and the most costly materials, the designer has managed to produce one of the most



36.

Church of San Carlo at Milan. From a Photograph.

unsatisfactory buildings in Europe. Internally it is meant to be a copy of the Pantheon at Rome, this being 105 ft. in diameter and 120 in height ; but, instead of the sublimity of the one great eye of the dome, there is in the Milanese example only an insignificant lantern, and light is introduced through the walls by mean-looking windows, scattered here and there round the building, and in two storeys. Notwithstanding that it possesses internally twenty-two monolithic columns of beautiful Baveno marble, and some good sculpture, the whole is thin, mean, and cold, to an extent seldom found anywhere else.

Externally the design is as bad. A portico of thirty-six Corinthian columns is arranged pretty much as in that of the British Museum.



Each of these is a monolith of marble 9 ft. in circumference, and the capitals and entablature are faultless ; but the central portico is crushed into insignificance by the dome of the church, which rises, like a great dish-cover, behind it ; and the wings are destroyed by having houses built behind them, with three storeys of windows under the porticoes and three more above them, so arranged as to compete with, and as far as possible destroy, any little dignity the dome itself might possess.

However painful the coarseness and vulgarity of Alessi and Ivrea may have been, their works are after all preferable to the tame and unmeaning Classicity of such a design as this, and which, unfortunately, is found also in Canova's church at Possagno, and is but too characteristic, not only of the architecture, but of all the Arts in Italy at the present day.

So enamoured were the Italians with their success in the employment of the dome, that all their great churches of the Renaissance partake more or less of this quasi-Byzantine type. Not only did it afford space and give dignity to the interior, but it gave to these buildings externally an elevation which their architects were otherwise unable to supply. We, who are familiar with the northern Gothic of the Middle Ages, know how gracefully the spire was fitted to the church in every position ; either as growing out of the intersection of the nave and transepts, or as twin guardians of the portal of the cathedral or minster, or as the single heavenward-pointing feature of the western front of the parish church. But the Italians knew nothing of this. In nine cases out of ten their campaniles were detached from the edifices to which they belonged, or, if joined to them, it was never as an integral or essential part of the design ; and so far from giving height and dignity to the whole, it only tended to dwarf the church, and did this at the expense of its own elevation. The dome, on the other hand, did for the Italian church what the spire did for the Gothic. It not only marked the sacred character of the edifice externally, but it raised it well above the houses, and added that elevation which, in towns at least, is so indispensable to architectural dignity.

#### V.—BASILICAN CHURCHES—EXTERIORS.

As most of the Italian churches were situated in the streets of towns, where only the entrance façades are exposed, it was to them that the attention of the architects was principally directed, and, not knowing the art of using the steeple to give dignity to these, they tried by richness of ornament to cover the defects of the design.

On this side of the Alps the parish church almost always stands free in its churchyard, the cathedral in its close, and every side of these buildings is consequently seen ; so that it becomes necessary to make every part ornamental, and in most cases the east end and the



37.

Church of San Zaccaria, Venice. From a Photograph.

flanks are as carefully designed, and sometimes even more beautiful, than the façade itself. In Italy it is hardly possible to quote a single instance in which, during the Renaissance period, either the apse or the flanks of an ordinary basilican church are treated ornamentally. All the art is lavished on the façade, and, in consequence of its not being returned along the sides, the whole design has, far too generally, an air of untruthfulness, and a want of completeness, which is often very offensive.

One of the finest of the early façades of Italy is that of San Zaccaria at Venice. The church was commenced in 1446, and internally shows Pointed arches and other peculiarities of that date. The façade seems to have been completed about 1515, and though not so splendid



as that of the Certosa at Pavia (Woodcut No. 22) and some of the more elaborate designs of the previous century, it is not only purer in detail, but reproduces more correctly the internal arrangements of the church. Though its dimensions are not greater than those of an ordinary Palladian front, the number and smallness of the parts make it appear infinitely larger, and, all the Classical details being merely subordinate ornaments, there is no falsehood or incongruity anywhere; while, the practical constructive lines being preserved, the whole has a unity and dignity we miss so generally in subsequent buildings. Its greatest defect is perhaps the circular form given to the pediment of the central and side aisles, which does not in this instance express the form of the roof. The curvilinear roof is, however, by no means unusual in Venice, and in the nearly contemporary church of Sta. Maria dei Miracoli (1480-89) the circular roof still exists, and the façade is surmounted by a semi-circular gable like this, but there following the exact lines of the roof, and in the School of St. Mark's and many other buildings this form is also found; so that, though it may appear somewhat unusual and strange to us, it was familiar to the Venetians of that day. They, in fact, borrowed it with so many other features of their Art from the Byzantines, with whom it had always been in use, and represented correctly the exterior of their vaults. But a further excuse for its introduction here is, that, as the design of these façades in Italy is never returned along the sides, the roofs form no part of the composition, and their form was consequently generally neglected.



33. Church of the Redentore. Reduced from Cicognara by Rosengarten.

One of the first difficulties which the architects encountered in using the Orders was to express the existence of side aisles as a part of the design. The most obvious way was to make the façade

in two storeys, as was very generally done on this side of the Alps, and by the Jesuits everywhere, and as had been already suggested by Alberti at Rimini (Woodcut No. 14) in the fifteenth century. It was, however, felt by the architects of the following epoch that this was sacrificing the great central aisle to the subordinate parts of the church, and suggesting two storeys, when in fact there was only one. The difficulty was boldly met by Palladio, in the façade he added to the Church of San Francesco della Vigna at Venice, which is one of his most admired compositions; but the great Order so completely overpowers the smaller, that the result is almost as displeasing as in St. Peter's at Rome. Nearly the same thing is observable in the church of the Redentore; but in this instance, there being practically no side aisles to the church, the little lean-tos on each side do not obtrude themselves to the same extent, and may be practically disregarded; so that the design as seen directly in front is confined to the

four pillars of the portico, and the Order belonging to the entrance, which is also that of the side aisles. When, however, the flanks of this church are seen in conjunction with the façade, the defects of the design are painfully manifest, and the incongruity of the two Orders becomes everywhere apparent. In order to avoid these defects, Palladio hit upon the expedient so much admired in his celebrated church of San Giorgio



39. Church of San Giorgio Maggiore, Venice. From Ciongnara.

Maggiore in the same city. By placing the larger Order on pedestals, and bringing the subordinate Order down to the floor-line, he rendered the disproportion between them so much less glaring that the effect is certainly as pleasing as it can well be expected to be. The real fact is, however, everywhere apparent, that the Orders are intractable for purposes they were never designed to subserve; and when an architect is bound to use only pillars of ten diameters, and to use these for all the purposes of internal and external decoration, he has forged fetters for himself from which no ingenuity has yet been able to set him free.

Unfortunately for the Arts of Italy at this age, the influence of Michael Angelo was supreme, and continued so during the whole of the sixteenth century. Even Raphael, his great rival, seems to have bowed



to it, and, if he had lived twenty years longer, would probably have been obliged to paint the meek Saviour of the Christians as a Hercules, and the Virgin as an Amazon, in order to keep pace with the taste of the day. Though Palladio's was a far gentler and more elegant mind than Michael Angelo's, he too could not escape the contagion, even if he had been inclined. What the latter had done at St. Peter's and elsewhere, was the standard of the day. Too impetuous to be controlled by construction, and too impatient to work out details, he had sought by bigness to excite astonishment, and mistook exaggeration for sublimity. His colossal Order of pilasters at St. Peter's, though astonishing from its size, is humiliating from its vulgarity; but it pleased his age, as his paintings and his sculpture had done. Every artist was obliged to paint up to his scale, and every architect felt himself bound to use as large an Order as his building would admit of, and seems to have acquiesced in the mistaken doctrine that largeness of details was productive of grandeur in the mass. Palladio was therefore probably not so much to blame if his age demanded, as it seems to have done, his employment of these large features on his façades. If he employed them, it was indispensable that he should also introduce a smaller Order to represent the aisles and minor parts of the design; and if he did not succeed in harmonising these two perfectly, he has at least been as successful in this as anyone else, and in all his details there is an elegance which charms, and a feeling of constructive propriety which makes itself felt, even in the most incongruous of his designs.

Subsequently to the Palladian period, architects were therefore hardly to blame when they agreed to return to the earlier practice, and to use the Orders merely as ornaments. As the bright climate of Italy enabled them to dispense with windows in their façades whenever they thought it expedient to do so, they met what they conceived to be all the exigencies of the case when they designed such a façade as that of the church of S. Maria Zobenico at Venice, built by G. Sardi in 1680, where the Orders, though more important than at San Zaccaria (Woodcut No. 37), are still mere ornaments, but so much more important than in that church as to become practically independent of the construction, and to produce a far less pleasing effect. It must also be confessed that the ornamentation is here overdone, and not always in the best taste; but, taken for what it is—merely an ornamental screen in front of a church—it is a very beautiful and charming composition.

Without attempting to enumerate the variety of façades of more or less beauty which are found facing the streets in all the great cities of Italy, those just described may be taken as types of them:—San Zaccaria represents the façades of the fifteenth century, when Classical elegance was introduced without being hampered with Classical forms; San Giorgio is one of the best examples of the Classical school of the sixteenth century, when a more literal system of copying was introduced



40.

*Church of Sta. Maria Zobenico, Venice. From Canaletti.*

by Palladio and his contemporaries ; and the church of Zobenico is a fine example of the reaction against the restraints of the purer style, which characterised the seventeenth century. The misfortune is, that this last form lent itself only too easily to the caprices of the Borrominis, Guarinis, and men of that class, and the Jesuits in particular abused its freedom to an extent that is often very offensive ; but, notwithstanding all this, the richness of the façades of this style is always attractive, and in spite of bad taste we are frequently forced to admire what our more sober judgment would lead us to condemn.



[THE FAÇADE OF STA. MARIA ZOBENICO.—The author puts the case of this composition correctly when he describes it as “merely an ornamental screen in front of a church;” and the reader may be asked to make it from this point of view a study in criticism. How far is it in accord with the true spirit of artistic architecture to put a “screen” of this kind “in front of” a building, which otherwise might, could, would, or should develop a “front” of its own, essentially and unmistakably its own, as part of itself, just as a man’s face is part of his head, and a mask only a mask? That the façade before us is most characteristically and avowedly, indeed demonstratively, a mask, is obvious; and a very pretty mask it is in its way. Given a gable wall with one doorway in the middle; and, subject to these most simple of all conditions, the designer is left absolutely to his own devices. Now when we look at the result and say designer, ought we to say architect; and when we say devices, ought we to say artistic treatment? Do not regard merely the Rococo or gingerbread style; the columns without columnar work to do, the broken-up entablatures, the broken-up podium, the broken-up pediment, the bolster-friezes, the sliding statuary, and so on; suppose the composition to be so far re-modelled throughout as to be in whatever refined form of Classic detail the reader may prefer. Let us even suppose the work to be executed in terra-cotta as a special excuse for making a “screen” of it, say a mask “in front of a church” in a brick-built London street; then how far is it admissible as good art? A great deal may be said upon this question: so much so that there is no harm in so leaving it as an exercise for the student-reader. The “true principles of Gothic architecture,” in Pugin’s reading of them, would pull the mind very strongly in one direction; the practice of the fashionable “Queen Anne” style, for example, would pull equally strongly in another. Is “Queen Anne” work or Flemish Rococo naturally screen-work? Does thoroughly good Gothic repudiate such screen-work? Is the screen-work of the Bank of England right or wrong? At any rate, it is by no means a discredit to the government of “*Ars Regina*” that her subjects are allowed a good deal of latitude in many other questions besides this, and that their efforts to do her honour are encouraged in many forms which do not always accord. And if discord sometimes arises, and even gets heated, so let it be.—ED.]

#### VI.—BASILICAN CHURCHES—INTERIORS.

In their interiors the Italian architects were hardly so fortunate as in their exteriors. The Classical Orders were originally designed by the Greeks for the external decoration of temples; and although the Romans afterwards employed them internally, it was generally with considerable modifications. In the great halls of their baths, which were what the Italian architects generally strove to copy, they introduced the fragment of an entablature over a column, but only as a bracket

when the pillar was placed against the wall—never when it was standing


free, where alone its use is objectionable. Their architects were fast getting rid of all traces of the entablature when the style perished; and it cannot but be considered as most unfortunate that the Cinque-cento architects should have reintroduced it for internal purposes.

As a general rule, the interiors of the Renaissance churches are cold and unmeaning; or, if these defects are obviated, it is, as at St. Peter's, at the expense not only of the simplicity but of the propriety of the architectural design.



41. Interior of San Giorgio Maggiore, Venice. From Selvatico.<sup>1</sup>

The earlier examples all fail from the infrequency and tenuity of the point of support. At San Zaccaria, for instance, the nave is divided from the side aisles by three tall arches, supported on two tall octagonal pillars, so thin, and apparently so weak, as to give a starved look to the whole. The same defect is observed in the Gothic cathedral of Florence, and generally in all Italian Mediæval churches. Their architects thought that they had done enough when they had met the engineering difficulties of the case, and had provided a support mechanically sufficient to carry the vault of the roof. They never perceived the artistic value of numerous points of support, nor the importance of superabundant strength in producing a satisfactory architectural effect. Notwithstanding this defect, the Cinque-cento construction was always truthful, and, so far, more pleasing than that of the subsequent age, when the most prominent parts of the design were generally added for effect only.



42. Plan of Church of St. Zenobio, Venice. From Cirognara. Scale 100 feet to 1 inch.

<sup>1</sup> 'Sulla Architettura e sulla Scultura in Venezia,' 8vo. Venice, 1847.




One of the most successful interiors of the age is generally admitted to be that of San Giorgio Maggiore at Venice, by Palladio. In this he has adopted the same device as in the exterior (Woodcut No. 41), by placing the larger Order on pedestals, and thus preventing such a discrepancy of size as would be fatal to either; but with all this the decoration is unmeaning, and the principal Order is felt to be useless. The mode also in which the clerestory windows cut into the vault is most unpleasing, and none of the parts seem as if they were designed for the purposes to which they are applied.

His other celebrated church is that of the Redentore, close by, on the Canal of the Giudecca. The nave is a great hall (Woodcut No. 42), 50 ft. wide by 105 in length, with narrow side-chapels, between which ranges a Corinthian Order, of great beauty in itself, and standing on the floor without pedestals. It is merely an ornament, however, and has no architectural connexion with the plain flat elliptical vault of the church, which is most disagreeably cut into by the windows that give light to the nave. A worse defect of the design is that, instead of the church expanding at the intersection, the supports of the dome actually contract it; and though the dome is of the same width as the nave, and has a semicircular tribune on each side, the arrangement is such that it looks smaller and more contracted than the nave that leads to it. If we add to these defects of design that, both here and at San Giorgio, no marble or colour is used—nothing but plain cold stone and whitewash—it will be understood how very unsatisfactory these interiors are, and how disappointing, after all the praise that has been lavished on them.

These defects are more apparent perhaps in Venice than they would be elsewhere, many of the churches of that city, as of Genoa, being internally rich beyond conception, with marbles of extreme rarity and beauty. In such churches as that of the Jesuits or the Barefooted Friars at Venice, or Sant' Ambrogio at Genoa, the criticism of the architect must give way to the feelings of the painter, and we must be content to be charmed by the richness of the colouring, and astonished at the wonderful elaboration of the details, without inquiring too closely whether or not it is all in the best taste.

The only church that fairly escapes this reproach is that of the Sta. Annunziata at Genoa, built at the sole expense of the Lomellini



43. Plan of Sta. Annunziata at Genoa. Scale 10 feet to 1 inch.



44. View of the Interior of the Church of Sta. Annunziata, Genoa. From Gauthier.

family, it is said, towards the end of the seventeenth century;<sup>1</sup> though how a church so pure in design came to be executed then is by no means clear. This church is a basilica of considerable dimensions, being 82 ft. wide, exclusive of the side chapels, and 250 feet long. The nave is separated from the aisles by a range of Corinthian columns of white marble, the fluting being inlaid with marbles of a warmer colour. The walls throughout, from the entrance to the apse, are covered with precious marbles, arranged in patterns of great beauty. The roof of the nave is divided transversely into three compartments, which prevents the awkwardness that is usually observed where windows of a semicircular form cut into a semicircular vault. Here it is done as

<sup>1</sup> Milizia ascribes the design to Puget. Born 1622; died 1694.



artistically as it could be done in the best Gothic vaults. The one defect that strikes the eye is that the hollow lines of the Corinthian capitals are too weak to support the pier-arches, though this criticism is equally applicable to all the original Roman basilicas of the Constantinian age; but, nevertheless, the whole is in such good taste, so rich and so elegant, that it is probably the very best church of its class in Italy.<sup>1</sup>

At Padua there are two very large and very fine churches—the cathedral and the now desecrated church of Sta. Giustina—both of the great age of the sixteenth century, and completed—in so far at least as their interiors are concerned—upon one uniform original design. In dimensions also they exceed almost any other churches of their age, excepting, of course, St. Peter's; and their proportions are generally good. But with all this it would be difficult to point out any similar buildings producing so little really good artistic effect. This arises from the extreme plainness, it may almost be said rudeness, of their details, which are all too large and too coarse for internal purposes, and repeated over and over again without any variation throughout their interiors. As works of engineering science they might be called good and appropriate examples, but as works of architecture they fail, principally because, though it cannot be denied that their design is ornamental, it is not ornamented. Their outline is grand and well proportioned, though monotonous; but they want that grace, that elegance of detail, which would bring them within the province of Architecture as a Fine Art, and without which a building remains in the domain of the engineer or builder.

One of the most important and, it may be added, most successful efforts made recently by the Italians in this direction, has been the rebuilding of the Great Basilica of St. Paul without the walls. As mentioned in a previous volume,<sup>2</sup> the original church was destroyed by fire in 1823, when most of the marble columns were so calcined by the heat that they could not again be used. Under these circumstances, the authorities wisely determined, instead of attempting to reproduce the old building, as we should certainly have done in this country, though the result could only have been a forgery and a sham, to rebuild the edifice from the foundation, retaining only the site and the exact dimensions of the old Basilica.

For this purpose they procured 80 monolithic columns of a very beautiful granite from Baveno, which takes a perfect polish, and to each of these was added a carefully sculptured Corinthian capital of

<sup>1</sup> Within the last few years the whole of this interior has been re-gilt and repainted, probably more gaily than was originally intended; and it consequently is just now deficient in that solemnity

we naturally look for in a religious edifice; but these are defects which time will cure, and meanwhile are by no means inherent in the design.

<sup>2</sup> 'History of Architecture,' vol. i. 368.

fine white marble. Above these are a range of busts in mosaic, and over them again a clerestory of tasteful design, and admitting a pleasing proportion of light. The only parts of the old building that remain are the triumphal arch, the mosaics of which are either those of the old church or copied from them, and the apse with its mosaics. The old Baldacchino<sup>1</sup> also retains its place under the very graceful new one, which is adorned with four very beautiful columns of Oriental alabaster, presented by the Pasha of Egypt. All this is in exquisite taste, and the old parts retained are just sufficient to remind you of the existence of the old church, without interfering with the harmony of the new.

Under these circumstances we are enabled in this instance to judge much more fairly and dispassionately regarding this style of architecture than we could in respect of its predecessor. There the associations with the time of Constantine, and the uninterrupted service which had continued during the vicissitudes of the succeeding fifteen centuries, which could hardly fail to impress the imagination; while the beautiful columns, torn it is said from the mausoleum of Hadrian, and the copies of them executed by the founder of the church, and all the additions and alterations of the Middle Ages, mixed history and archæology with our other impressions, and prevented a calm view being taken of its purely artistic merits. As it stands, all that wealth and art can do for a building of this size has been done, and we are enabled to appreciate its merits and defects without any disturbing elements, and, on the whole, the result seems to be against this style as suitable for the building of Basilican churches.

The first and radical defect of the design is the immense disproportionate width of the central nave—80 feet by 290 in length—which dwarfs not only the pillars on either side, but all the other proportions, to a most disagreeable extent. To make it higher would be only to make the pillars look still smaller; to make it longer would only increase its monotony. Santa Maria Maggiore<sup>2</sup> is better, because, with a similar disposition on either hand, it is only 60 feet wide. But the real remedy was that adopted by the Mediæval architects at Pisa, where, with similar pillars and arcades, the width of the central aisle is under 40 feet, and the height 100 feet. This would have given the aisles and all the parts their proper relative value, but it would no longer have been a Constantinian Basilica.

Another defect is the prosaic squareness of the section. If every pilaster of the clerestory were replaced by a bold bracket in wood, or some more permanent material, it would relieve this. But the real remedy would be for every third pillar to be doubled laterally, and one—perhaps taller than the others—to stand forward to receive a

<sup>1</sup> Interesting as one of those objects which suggested the design of the Albert

Memorial in Hyde Park.

<sup>2</sup> *History of Architecture*, vol. i. p. 369.





45. Church of St. Paul's outside the walls, as recently rebuilt. From a Photograph.

great ornamented semicircular rib to span the nave and support the roof. This would give the variety and perspective wanted, but it would not redeem the want of height.

A very disagreeable effect is also produced from the transept being of a totally different design from the nave, and consequently the point where they meet not only does not harmonise and carry on the lines of the nave, but it misses all that poetry of perspective which makes this part of a Mediæval cathedral so fascinating.

These defects of design are sufficient to account for the disappointment this class of buildings produces both at Rome and Munich, or wherever they can be studied apart from associations; and they are such as it is feared are inherent in the design, and cannot be removed by any richness or beauty of detail. If this is so, it is in vain to expect that basilicas of this class can produce the grandeur and poetry of effect that is produced by the nave of St. Peter's, in spite of all its defects of detail, or that a church of this sort can ever rival the appropriateness of detail or proportion which characterises such an interior as that of the Annunciata at Genoa (Woodcut No. 44). The fact is the whole proportions of the building are bad, and it wants that expression of force and power which are indispensable for architectural effect.

The exterior of the building calls for very little remark. The placing of the campanile behind, and hardly attached, to the apse, is not pleasing, but the flanks are unobjectionable, and the façade is still too incomplete to admit of the effect being appreciated. With its grand mosaics, it aspires to reproduce the appearance of the original

building when it was new, and, like the interior, must be judged by that standard, and not as an original creation of the Italian architects of the present day.

So complete has the ascendancy of the Gothic style now become, that though it may enable us to appreciate the merits or defects of such a revival as that of St. Paul's, it makes it extremely difficult to form an impartial judgment with regard to the true Renaissance buildings of the Italians. We have got so completely into the habit of measuring everything by a Mediaeval standard, that an ecclesiastical edifice is judged to be perfect or imperfect in the exact ratio in which it approaches to or recedes from the Gothic type; and its intrinsic merits are consequently too often overlooked. Taken as a whole, however, it is probably not unjust to assert that, after four centuries of labour, the Italians have failed to produce a satisfactory style of Ecclesiastical Architecture. The type which Alberti may be said to have invented in Sant' Andrea at Mantua has been reproduced some hundreds of times on all scales, from that of St. Peter's at Rome to that of the smallest village church, and with infinite variations of detail or arrangement. These, however, have always been the products of individual taste or talent, or of individual caprice or ignorance, and the result has consequently been that little or no progress has been made; so that at the present hour the Italians are just where they were in this respect three centuries ago. Although they have occasionally in the meanwhile produced some edifices to which it is impossible to refuse our admiration, it must be confessed that, considering their opportunities, the result is on the whole negative and unsatisfactory.

[IS ITALIAN CHURCH ARCHITECTURE A FAILURE?—A distinction must be here drawn between the Church Art as a whole of the Italian or Modern European style, and the Church Art as a part thereof which has been produced on the soil of Italy. Compared with French churches of the higher Classic school, it may be said that the Italian churches, with all their merits, are inferior in that delicacy of treatment in which the French have long excelled all other nations. But it would be surely a mistake to affirm nowadays that there is failure in the modern Classic church work of Europe as a whole; taking the best examples, of course, as the true test of success, and ignoring the worst as the usual incidental blunders of human handiwork. To compare a modern Classic church of high class with either an authentic Mediaeval church or a modern imitation of it, is impossible, except upon the basis of some previous understanding as to the precise ritual of Divine worship which is to be accommodated and accentuated; and this is a consideration which presently introduces matters of sentiment so subtle that the case really acquires almost a local



character. The generality of English people of Ecclesiastical tastes have at the present moment an exclusive preference for a Gothic edifice ; but on the Continent the preference is different ; and, both sides having their sufficient reasons, each is bound to respect the other's opinion. Dismissing from our minds, therefore, all but the critical appreciation of art, it seems impossible to deny, first, that the Classic manner, if handled to perfection, admits of the composition of most admirable architecture for a Temple of Christian worship ; and, secondly, that examples are to be found in Europe, although perhaps not so many as could be desired, which are excellent proofs of that capability. One thing that has to be borne in mind is that church-builders in these days of political economy do not possess the financial resources which their forefathers had at command in the Ages of Faith.—ED.]

## CHAPTER II.

### SECULAR ARCHITECTURE.

---

I. FLORENCE.—II. VENICE.—III. ROME.—IV. VICENZA.—V. GENOA.—VI. MANTUA.  
—VII. MILAN.—VIII. TURIN, NAPLES, &c.—IX. CONCLUSION.

THE adaptation of Classical forms to Civil Architecture commenced in Italy under much more favourable and more legitimate circumstances than those which had marked its application to Ecclesiastical Art. Except in Venice, no palaces or public buildings existed during the Middle Ages at all adapted to the wants of the new state of society which was everywhere developing itself during the Cinque-cento period. The architects were not tearing themselves away<sup>1</sup> from a well-understood and hallowed type, as was the case with churches, in order to introduce a new and, to a great extent, an inappropriate style of decoration. They had in Civic Architecture nothing to destroy, but everything to create. They, fortunately, were also without any direct models for imitation, for, though remains of temples existed everywhere, few palaces, and scarcely any domestic buildings, of the Classical period remained which could be copied. They had only to borrow and adapt to their purpose the beautiful details of Classical Art, and to emulate so far as they could that grandeur and breadth of design which characterised the works of the Romans; and had they done this, and this only, all would have gone well. It soon, however, became apparent that those architects who were exercising their misdirected ingenuity to make churches look like heathen temples, could not long resist the temptation of making their civil buildings look like what they fancied (most mistakenly) the civil buildings of the Romans must have been. This did not, however, take place in the fifteenth century. During that early period it is delightful to observe how spontaneous the growth of the new style was; how little individuality there is in the designs, and how completely each city and each province expressed its own feelings and its own wants in the buildings it then erected.

[<sup>1</sup> THE WRENCH AT THE RENAISSANCE.—The expression here used—"Architects tearing themselves away from a well-understood and hallowed type of churches"—is one that must not be taken in an erroneous sense.



The history of Art contains no cataclysms ; sudden revolutions are impossible ; *ars longum est*—in all that pertains to it “the wheels of God grind slowly.” Not long ago the popular idea of the rise of ancient Greek Art was a sudden upheaving of sunshine in a dark sky. But we now know better ; there was a long and gradual dawn, which we can trace with great interest and critical profit. The tedious process by which Mediæval Art came onward from very small beginnings in very bad times has long been familiar to the archæologist. Even our local English episode of the modern Gothic revival began, as we know, a hundred years and more before it could claim to be a success ; and indeed the much less important Rococo fashion which prevails with us in 1890, and which still looks like a mushroom, has had some thirty years of preparation. So great a revolution, therefore, as the Renaissance of the Antique must not be imagined to have occurred, or even originated, suddenly. It is true that when the new social system called upon them for palaces instead of castles, the Italian architects were more at liberty than in their church work ; but still there was no wrench even in church work ; the new mode made its way in the usual manner, by leisurely degrees. On Italian ground, moreover, the spirit of North-European Gothicism which animated Western ecclesiology, and which hallowed it, had never acquired a footing.

Perhaps it may also be said that, while in cultured Italy the return to antiquity—or rather to where antiquity left off—was initiated and encouraged in the cloister, in the unsophisticated Western countries it was resisted there. All amongst the people, too, there was in Italy a spirit of liberty growing up which had by no means yet reached the other side of the Alps. The artistic revolution, therefore, no doubt, had less to do in Italy ; but that it still took its own time must be always recognised. Neither ought we to accept without due reflection the forcible language in which the Italian reformers are spoken of as having concerned themselves chiefly with imitating Roman temples in their churches, and supposed Roman houses in their palaces. If they imitated the old basilicas in their churches, it will now be acknowledged, not only that they did well, but that the circumstance tells very much against the theory of their slavish copyism ; and that they could not design such a façade as that of the Valmarina Palace (Illustration No. 7) without previously imagining what the ancients must have made of some corresponding subject is not at all what the reader ought to understand, bearing in mind, as he ought always to do, that our author expected and intended his observations to be read with the same freedom of judgment with which they were written. It ought also to be pointed out that the reader's idea of what “copying” means in architectural designs will depend very much upon whether he himself is, or is not, a working designer. To the amateur critic resemblances often appear to be striking which to the experienced artist are scarcely discernible. This

is a well-known fact in simpler matters. The average Englishman, who regards himself as a most discriminating observer, thinks all Chinamen are alike. But it is also well understood that the equally self-confident Chinaman thinks all Englishmen are alike, and is even more amused at the likeness. How many intelligent people there are who will tell us any day that St. Paul's in London is almost exactly like St. Peter's in Rome, and was, in fact, "copied" from it, only on a reduced scale? There is no doubt about the circumstance that the Scotch Church in Regent Square, Bloomsbury, a work which Sir William Tite in his very young days won in competition, was considered at the time to be a direct "copy" of York Minster, and so good a copy that even genial Professor Donaldson, half a century later, reminded a large assembly of architects, to their great amusement (it was after dinner), that Sir William had been "the leading Gothic architect of his day!" None know better than the leading Gothic architects of the present time how readily their clients and others see resemblances where every effort has been laboriously expended upon the achievement of novelty. It cannot be denied that the copying of exact proportions from the ancient "Orders" was carried to an extreme; but even in this it can scarcely be affirmed that the world of modern Classic architects has ever been averse to encourage attempts to accommodate or even improve those details; and the French are certainly under the impression that they themselves have occasionally succeeded, difficult as it has been to do so.—ED.]

Nothing can be more magnificent than the bold, massive, rusticated palaces which were erected at Florence and Sienna during this period—so characteristic of the manly energy of these daring and ambitious, but somewhat troublesome, republics during the Medicean era.

Equally characteristic are the richly-adorned façades of the Venetian nobles—bespeaking wealth combined with luxury, and the security of a well-governed and peaceful city, strongly tinged with an Oriental love of magnificence and display.

The palaces of Rome, on the other hand, though princely, are ostentatious, and, though frequently designed in the grandest style, fell easily under the influence of the Classical remains among which they were erected, and soon lost the distinctive originality which adhered for a longer period to Florence and Venice, and attained in consequence in those cities a more complete development than in the capital itself. Even, however, in their best age the Roman palaces had neither the manly vigour of the Florentine examples, nor the graceful luxuriousness of those of Venice.

Early in the sixteenth century these differences disappeared; and, under the influence of Sansovino, Vignola, and Palladio, all Italy was reduced to one standard of architectural design. When the style was



new, it was, and must have been, most fascinating. There was a largeness about its parts, an elegance in its details, and it called up associations so dear to Italians of that age, that it is easy to understand the enthusiasm with which men hailed it as a symbol of the revival of the glories of the Roman Empire. The enthusiasm soon died out, for Italy in the seventeenth was no longer what it had been in the sixteenth century. Though, from Italian influence, the style spread abroad over all Europe, it soon acquired at home that commonplace character which distinguishes the Renaissance buildings of Verona, Vicenza, Genoa, and all the later buildings throughout Italy. The meaning of the style was lost, and that dead sameness of design was produced which we are now struggling against, but by convulsive efforts, far more disastrous in the meanwhile than the stately bondage from which we are trying to emancipate ourselves.

### I.—FLORENCE.

The history of Secular Architecture in Florence opens with the erection of two of her most magnificent palaces—the Medicean, since called the Riccardi, commenced in 1430, and the Pitti, it is said, in 1435. The former, designed by Michelozzo,<sup>1</sup> notwithstanding its early date, illustrates all the best characteristics of the style. It possesses a splendid façade, 300 ft. in length by 90 in height. The lower storey, which is considerably higher than the other two, is also bolder, and pierced with only a very few openings, and these spaced unsymmetrically, as if in proud contempt of those structural exigencies which must govern all frailer constructions. Its section (Woodcut No. 47) shows how bold the projections of the cornice are, and also illustrates, what it is necessary to bear in mind to understand the design of these Italian palaces, that the top storey is generally the principal of the two upper ones, which are usually those devoted to state purposes, and either the mezzanine or the rear of the block to domestic uses.

The most obvious objection to this design is the monotony of the two upper storeys of windows, and it would perhaps have been better if they had been grouped to some little extent. It must be observed, however, that the object of the design was to suggest two great suites of apartments arranged for festal purposes only, without any reference to either domestic or constructive exigencies—an impression which this façade most perfectly conveys.


The greatest ornament of the whole façade is the cornicione, whose projection is proportioned to the mass below very much as the Classical

---

<sup>1</sup> Born about 1402; died about 1470.

Corinthian cornice is to the pillar that supports it, while at the same time it is so simplified as to suit the rustic mass which it so nobly crowns.

The Pitti is designed on even a larger scale, the façade being 490 ft. in extent, three storeys high in the centre, each storey 40 ft. in height, and the immense windows of each being 24 ft. apart from centre to centre. With such dimensions as these, even a brick building would be grand; but when we add to this, the boldest rustication all over the façade, and cornices of simple but bold outline, there is no palace in Europe to compare with it for grandeur, though many may surpass it in elegance. The design is said to have



46. Elevation of part of the Façade of Riccardi Palace, Florence. From Grandjean.<sup>1</sup>


been by Brunelleschi, but it is doubtful how far this is the case, or at all events how much may be due to Michelozzo, who certainly assisted in its erection, or to Amanati, who continued the building, left incomplete at Brunelleschi's death in 1444. The courtyard displays the three Classical Orders arranged in storeys one over another, but rusticated, as if in a vain endeavour to assimilate themselves to the façade. The result, however, is only to destroy their grace, without imparting to them any of the dignity it is sought by the process to attain to. It was more probably designed by Luca Fancelli, to whom Brunelleschi is said to have confided the execution of the whole; and designing a building, and erecting it, were not then such distinct departments of the art as they have since become.

<sup>1</sup> 'Architettura Toscana,' fol. Paris, 1837.



The absence of the crowning projecting cornice is the defect which renders this palace, as an architectural object, inferior to the Riccardi. Instead of a feature so beautiful and well-proportioned as we find there, we have only such a string course as this (Woodcut No. 48), which, for such a building, is perhaps the most insignificant termination that ever was suggested. Was it intended to add a fourth storey?—or is this only the blundering of Amanati? It almost seems as if the first is the correct theory, for at so early a period it is difficult to conceive personal feelings or taste interfering with so grand a design.

Perhaps the most satisfactory of these palaces, as a whole and



47.


Section of Riccardi Palace, Florence. From Grandjean.

complete design, is the Strozzi, designed by Cronaca,<sup>1</sup> and commenced in the year 1489. It stands perfectly free on all sides, and is a rectangle 190 ft. by 138 ; like all the rest, in three storeys, measuring together upwards of 100 ft. in height. The cornice that crowns the whole is not so well designed as that of the Riccardi, but extremely well proportioned to the bold, simple building which it crowns, and the windows of the two upper storeys are elegant in design, and appropriate to their situation. It may be that this palace is too massive and too gloomy for imitation ; but, taking into account the age when it was built, and the necessity of security combined with purposes of State to which it was to be applied, it will be difficult to find a more faultless design in any city of modern Europe, or one which combines so

<sup>1</sup> Born 1454; died 1503.

harmoniously local and social characteristics with the elegance of Classical details, a conjunction which has been practically the aim of almost every building of modern times, but very seldom so successfully attained as in this example.

The Rucellai Palace was commenced in 1460, from designs by Leon Battista Alberti; and although it has not the stern magnificence of those just mentioned, it must be confessed it gains in elegance from his Classical taste nearly as much as it loses in grandeur. It is probably the first instance in which pilasters form so essential a part of



45. Cornice of Pitti Palace, Florence.

the design as they do here, and in it we first see an effect which afterwards became so detrimental, in the exaggeration of the string courses of the first and second storeys, in order to make them entablatures in proportion to the Orders; and, what is worse, the paring down of the upper cornice to reduce it to nearly the same amount of projection. In this example these defects are treated so gently, and with such taste, that they do not strike at first sight, but they are the seeds of much that was afterwards so destructive to architectural design. It should also be observed that a certain


amount of play is given in this façade by making the spaces between the pilasters wider over the doorways than elsewhere, and by the variety given to the form of the rustication throughout. All these evidences of thought and care add very considerably to the general effect of the whole construction.

[**LARGE-STONE WORK AND SMALL-STONE WORK.**—If we shut our eyes for a moment to all architectural history, and think merely of stone as the principal material by whose means building has to be executed and architecture evolved, our reflections may take this turn. There are certain localities where stone is to be quarried in large blocks, sometimes very large indeed: and there are others where it is only to be had in small pieces, sometimes very small. Between these extremes there is the usual gradation; but let us fix our attention on the extremes themselves for an æsthetic reason. It is plain that the constructive modes which accord with the use of the very large stones—say 5 or 6 ft. and upwards in length—must be different from those which apply to the use of very small stones—say under 2 ft. To come at once to the point practically, the large stones suggest trabeation or lintel-work, and the small stones arcuation or arch-work; and thus two entirely different first principles of design are established at once and for ever—principles



of constructive design and corresponding principles of artistic design. Let us then reopen our eyes to the examples of historic architecture, and we perceive that, roughly speaking, the nations before the commencement of the Christian era achieved their building by the use of large stones and produced the colonnade, while the builders of the subsequent centuries, employing small stones, produced the arcade; each of these leading features carrying with it an elaborate scheme of construction and fine art. We also find, during the second of these great periods, two further incidents. First there is what we may call the use of medium stones—which seems to lead to no speciality of design; but secondly there is the use of intermixed sizes, and this at once becomes identified with a novel principle, which we see operating in two peculiar forms. On the one hand there appears the combination of colonnade and arcade—of lintel-work constructed with the large stones and arch-work constructed with the small; on the other hand we have the acceptance of the superficial forms of large-stone work subject to their construction with small stones. Let us next take up such a material as bricks or squared flints. It requires no great amount of thought to perceive clearly enough, that even with the smallest materials a great Gothic cathedral of the thirteenth century could be built in all its parts, with all essential graces and all essential equipoise, granting little else by way of exception beyond such articles as finials, copings, sills, and other weather-stones. But when we look inquiringly at some modern Classic portico on a large scale, and discover that the columns, instead of being monoliths—as would be supposed at a distance—are really built up laboriously of small blocks, three or four, or even six or eight in each shallow course, or at the best that they are constructed of “drums;” that the architrave is formed ingeniously of flat arches instead of lintels; and that the frieze and great cornice are with equal ingenuity discharging-arched, metal-cramped, and what not; all to make the small stones produce the effect of large, because the one is matter of fashion and the other of necessity; then we surely cannot but wonder that the designer should have accepted the fashion at such a price. On the same ground, we should feel the same wonder, of course, if the architect of a church all in arcuation should build his arches with large blocks of stone; to say nothing of the artifice of making an entire arch, as is sometimes done for convenience, out of a single block. (Although, be it remembered, two blocks with a joint at the apex make a legitimate primitive arch). But when we come to the ordinary house-work of our own day, for which sufficiently large blocks of stone could be had without difficulty at a price, but smaller stuff, or rubble, or brick, have to be used at a lower price, then, so far at least as the surface goes, perhaps it may be said to be enough if the large stone members are built in large stones, and the rest in the small material; and the critic, amongst other things, will also make allowance for the inconvenient rule of construction that even in columns and shafts the

stone must be laid on its natural bed. True, when the surface is thus so far rationalised, it may not have to be taken as admitted that the demands of the structuresque are fully satisfied; but still the principle of lenient criticism will not be ignored by the thoughtful mind, so long as the reasonable possibilities of the case are seen to have been considered. A wall, for example, of ashlar is not a make-believe because it is not built of blocks of its full thickness; it is to be hoped that it is not faced with mere little slabs 6 or even 4 inches thick, but all the



49

Part of the Façade of the Rucellai Palace, Florence. From Grandjean.

world knows that it is faced and not solid. To revert to a most notable example already dealt with, one cause of the "failure" of St. Peter's may be described thus:—the edifice, having regard to its detail, is designed on a scale which overreaches the practical limits of even large-stone work; to realise the design in monolithic work, or anything like it, would be manifestly impossible as respects the main "Order" of the church either outside or in; it would be quite enough to attempt it in the case of the dome.—*Ed.*]


The Gondi Palace, designed by Giuliano da Sangallo,<sup>1</sup> and commenced in 1490, is less happy than those enumerated above, from the fact of the windows not being divided by mullions, and its cornice being also inferior in design and less salient in projection, though it

<sup>1</sup> Born 1443; died 1517.



still possesses many beauties that would render it remarkable except as a member of such a group.

The façade of the Piccolomini Palace at Sienna, though of dimensions nearly equal to the Strozzi, being 140 ft. wide by about 100 in height, and designed in what at first sight appears to be the same style, is painfully inferior; first, in consequence of the comparative smallness of the stones employed, and, secondly, because a mezzanine is introduced in the basement, and an attic smuggled into the frieze



56.

Guadagni Palace, Florence. From Grandjean.

under the cornice; and the whole looks so meagre as to detract painfully from the majesty of the style. It was built very early in the sixteenth century, from designs by Francesco di Giorgio.

The same architect furnished the designs, in 1492, for the Spannocchi Palace in the same city; which, though much smaller than the last named, being 74 ft. wide and 80 ft. in height, is still far more beautiful as a work of Art; and its cornice, with a mask between each of the great consoles that support it, is one of the most elegant, if not the grandest, of the whole series. The palace has, however, the defect of the Sienna buildings, that the stones employed are too small to give

effect to a design depending so much on rustication as was always the case with the Tuscan palaces.

There are two other palaces in Florence the designs of which are attributed to Bramante—the Guadagni (Woodcut No. 50) and the Nicolini. Their façades are nearly square—70 ft. each way—and almost identical, except that the first named is richly ornamented by decoration in Sgraffitti.<sup>1</sup> Both these palaces are full of elegance, and in the style peculiar to Florence, though probably in a more modern age than that to which they are ascribed, their most marked peculiarity being an open colonnade under the cornice, which, in a hot climate, is a very charming arrangement for domestic enjoyment, as well as an artistic one for architectural effect. They possess also a lightness and elegance of detail throughout, which, though neither so grand nor so monumental as the older rusticated palaces, is more suited to modern ideas of social security combined with elegance.

The series of really good and characteristic buildings closes at Florence with the Pandolfini Palace, commenced in 1520, it is said from designs by the celebrated Raphael d'Urbino, but was probably by Francesco Aristotile and his brother Bastiano,<sup>2</sup> who certainly finished it. Though small—the principal façade, exclusive of the wing, being only 75 ft. wide by 50 high—it is still a dignified and elegant design. The usual rustication is abandoned, except at the angles and round the “porte cochère,” and the windows are no longer divided by mullions; but a smaller Order, with a pediment over each opening, frames every window. As used in this instance, these can hardly be called defects, and the panelling between the windows on the first floor gives a unity to the whole composition. In itself there is little to object to in the design of this palace; but it is transitional—the last of a good, the first of a bad, class of buildings, in which the restraints were soon thrown off which guided the architect in making the design.

The Bartolini Palace, commenced in the same year from the designs of Baccio d'Agnolo,<sup>3</sup> shows the same elegance and the same defects of detail; but, from its being a three-storeyed building, 55 ft. in width and 70 in height, it has a more commonplace and less palatial look than the other.

The beauty and appropriateness of their own rusticated style seems to have prevented the Florentines from ever sinking into the third or lowest stage of Italian Architecture. The second was reached in the

<sup>1</sup> Sgraffitto is a name applied to a mode of decoration not unusual in Italy. The building intended to be so decorated is first covered with a coating of black plaster, over this is laid a thin coat of white, and, by engraving on this, the design

comes out in black. In that climate it seems a very permanent mode of ornamentation.

<sup>2</sup> Born 1481; died 1551.

<sup>3</sup> Born 1460; died 1543.



Rucellai, where pilasters were introduced unmeaningly, where entablatures were used as string courses, and where, consequently, the actual cornice was only a third string course perhaps a little exaggerated. In other hands than Alberti's this might have been fatal, but it escaped. Nowhere in Florence do we find pilasters running through two or three storeys as in the designs of Michael Angelo and Palladio, and ornamentation consequently divorced from construction, which proved to be the third stage of downward progress. It must be confessed, however, that this mode of using pilasters is a peculiarity more frequently found on this side of the Alps than on the other, though it is wholly an invention of the Italian architects of the sixteenth century.

After the middle of the sixteenth century there are no domestic buildings in Florence which are remarkable either for originality or magnificence. But those enumerated above form a group as worthy of admiration as any to be found in any city of modern Europe, not only for its splendour, but for its appropriateness. It proves, if anything were wanted to prove it, how easily Classical details can be appropriated to modern uses when guided with judgment and taste, and how even the ancients themselves may be surpassed in this peculiar walk. It is very uncertain, from any information we have, whether any of the palaces of the ancients were at all equal in style to these, though the brick and stucco residences of the Roman emperors were larger than the whole of them put together.

It may be regretted that the boldness of the features of this style renders it appropriate only to buildings designed on the scale of these Florentine palaces, and consequently, when attempts are made in modern times to copy them in stucco, and with storeys only 15 or 20 ft. high, the result is as painful as that of applying the architecture of the Parthenon to the front of a barber's shop. The Florentine style is only appropriate to the residences of princes as magnificent as the old Florentine nobles were, and cannot be toned down to citizen and utilitarian uses; though worthy of the warmest admiration as we find it employed in the province where it was first introduced.

## II.—VENICE.

The history of the revival of Architecture in Venice is extremely different from that of Florence. She had no *fanatico* like Brunelleschi, no enthusiastic scholar like Alberti, to advocate the cause of antiquity, nor was she a new city in the fifteenth century. Already her Doge possessed a palace worthy of his greatness—the Foscari and Pisani were lodged in mansions suitable to their rank; there existed the Casa d'Oro, and numberless smaller palaces and houses, displaying as much architectural magnificence as the wealth or rank of their owners.

entitled them to. There was also the fact that Venice had no Classical remains within her Lagoon, and no great sympathy with Rome, which her citizens did not care to imitate, but rather felt that they had already surpassed her. The Venetians clung therefore to a style which they had made almost their own, long after the other cities of Italy had abandoned it; and even as late as the sixteenth century we find Pointed arches in the courtyard of the Doge's Palace and in the windows of the upper part of the external façade. Still it was impossible to resist the fashion that was everywhere prevailing, and we find about the years 1580-85, forty years after Brunelleschi's death, and after Alberti had been gathered to his fathers, that the Venetians too adopted Classical details in the buildings they thereafter commenced, but it was with a Gothic feeling, unknown at this time in any other part of Italy.

For about half a century from this time, or till about 1630, all the buildings of Venice were in a singularly elegant transitional style, about as essentially Venetian as the Gothic buildings of the city had been, almost all of them of great beauty and elegance, but still so Mediæval that neither their dates nor the names of their architects can be very satisfactorily ascertained.

In the next half-century (1630-1680) the Architecture of the city was in the hands of San Michele, Sansovino, Palladio, Da Ponte, and Scamozzi; and it is to this period that Venice owes its grandest architectural development and its most striking buildings.

In the century that followed we have the works of Longhena, Benoni, Temanza, and other less-known names; and many of the richest, though the least tasteful, of the palaces of that city, were erected from their designs. After 1780 the city may be said to have ceased to build, and what has since been done has been by the French and Germans.

The modern architectural history of Venice is thus comprised in the two centuries that elapsed from 1485 to 1685, and this is divided into two nearly equal halves. In the first, we have an elegant and tasteful style, free from most of the faults of the Renaissance, and combining picturesqueness with appropriateness. In the second, the style is statelier and more Classical, but far less picturesque; and the designs seldom escape from displaying a style of ornamentation at variance with the internal arrangements or constructive necessities of the buildings.

In the first age we have the very remarkable churches mentioned above—Sta. Maria dei Miracoli (1480-89) and San Zaccaria (Woodcut No. 37). There is also the School of St. Mark, commenced after the fire in 1485, and that of San Rocca (1489), displaying a more ambitious attempt at Classicity, but without much elegance or success.

The great undertaking of this age was the rebuilding of the internal court of the Ducal Palace. It was commenced in 1486 by an architect of the name of Antonio Bregno, and finished in 1550 by another, of the name of Scarpagnino. The lower storey of this court is





51. North-Eastern Angle of Courtyard in Doge's Palace, Venice. From a Photograph.

singularly well designed, the polygonal form of the piers giving great strength without heaviness, and the panelling giving elegance and accentuation without bad taste. The introduction of the Pointed arch in the arcade above is not so happy. In itself, as frequently remarked before,<sup>1</sup> the Pointed is not a pleasing form of arch; and, although the mode in which it is used in Gothic buildings remedies its inherent defects and renders it beautiful, when used nakedly it is always unpleasing. In the storeys above this, the friezes are magnified into such broad belts of ornamental sculpture that they cease to be copies of Classical forms, and become in appearance what they are in reality, ornamental wall-spaces between the storeys. This, with the panelling between the windows, makes up a design singularly pleasing for the decoration of a courtyard, though it wants the symmetry which would

<sup>1</sup> 'History of Architecture,' *passim*.

render it suitable for a façade which could be seen at once, and grasped as a whole. The arcades<sup>1</sup> on the ground floor of the two other sides of this courtyard are in the same style and of the same age as those of the façade just described. In fact, the whole wall, from the pavement up to the cornice, was built when the palace was remodelled at this period; but, as the upper part stood upon arches of Cinque-cento design, it was not thought necessary to Gothicise those in the courtyard, as was done with the windows on the external façades. The upper external walls, being erected over the arcades of the older Gothic building which were retained, were treated as we now find them in order to harmonise with the substructure which supported them.

The upper part of the walls on the south and west sides of the court is left in plain brickwork, and the windows with only very slight ornamental mouldings, and these are of the Cinque-cento style of the period, though the opposite external windows, of the same age, in the same room, are designed with Gothic forms. Possibly it was intended to stucco the inner wall and paint it in fresco; but if so, this intention was never carried out, and it has now a meagre and discordant effect as compared with either the façades attached to the basilica of St. Mark's, or the eastern, which was the residence proper of the Doge.

Next in importance to this are the *Procuratie Vecchie*, occupying the northern side of the Piazza of St. Mark, though they are far from being a pleasing example of the style, being far too attenuated for architectural effect. The lower arcades are wide, and the piers weak in themselves, and doubly so in appearance, when it is seen that each has to support two smaller arcades, the piers of one of which stand on the crown of the lower arch. The deep frieze of the upper storey pierced with circular windows is also objectionable, but not so much so as the strange battlement that crowns the whole. Nearly the same remarks apply to the Clock Tower, which finishes the range towards St. Mark's, which can only be called picturesque and inoffensive, for when examined critically it really has no kind of architectural merit. Both these buildings would be open to harsher criticism than even this if found elsewhere; but the climate, the adjuncts, and the memories of the spot, induce most tourists and many architects to overlook those defects, and only to consider them as parts of a great whole, the beauty of whose grouping conceals the deficiencies of the parts of which it is composed.

Of the palaces of this age, the largest, and perhaps the grandest, is

---

<sup>1</sup> The northern façade of the School of Mines in Piccadilly is copied from this courtyard—the arcades of the lower storey literally; the upper storey with some modifications, which are improvements, but still very like the original.





52.


Vandramini Palace, Venice. From a Photograph.

the Trevisano. Its façade is 85 ft. wide, and 75 in height, divided into four storeys. To some extent it has the same defect as the buildings last mentioned of too great lightness, but the relief afforded by the more solid parts on either flank remedies this to a very great extent, and makes it on the whole a very pleasing composition.

The *chefs-d'œuvre* of the style, however, are the Palazzi Vandramini and the original Cornaro, the former being perhaps without exception the most beautiful in Venice. Nothing can exceed the beauty of the proportions of the three cornices, and the dignity of that which crowns the whole. The base, too, is sufficiently solid without being heavy, and, the windows being all mullioned, and the spaces between reinforced with three-quarter columns, there is no appearance of weakness anywhere : while there is almost as much opening for light and air as in the Palazzo Trevisano, or any building of its age. The Cornaro is similar in design, except that its base is higher and more solid, and there are only two windows instead of three in the centre. In both the details are designed with singular elegance, and what ornament there is, besides being appropriate and good, is so arranged that it

supplements the "Orders," and as it were links the parts together, so that the whole appears as parts of one original design. There is perhaps no other modern building in which Classical pillars are used with so little feeling that they are borrowed or uselessly applied; every part is equally rich and ornamental, and every ornament seems designed for the place where it is found. The dimensions of the façade of the Vandramini Palace are less than those of the Trevisano, being only 80 ft. by 65 in height; but this is sufficient to give all the effect required in such a design as this.

The Palazzo Camerlinghi, close to the Rialto, is another building of



53. End Elevation of Palazzo Camerlinghi, Venice.  
From Cicognara.

the same class, said to have been finished in 1525, and shows the same elegance of detail which characterizes all the buildings of the age, though the disposition of the parts is not so happy in this as in those last quoted; and the excess of window-space gives to the whole design a degree of weakness almost equal to that of the Procuratie Vecchie, and which is very destructive of true architectural effect.

This excess of lightness is in fact the principal defect in the Venetian designs of this age, and is the more remarkable when contrasted with the opposite characteristic in those of Florence. It may be argued that if the internal arrangements of the buildings required it, the true principle of good architecture is that it should be supplied. This is quite true; but if utilitarian exigencies are made to govern the artistic absolutely, it may

happen that the design is taken out of the category of Fine Art, and reduced to being a mere example of practical building. The taste displayed, and the amount of ornament exhibited in these early Venetian examples, are quite sufficient to save them from this reproach, though, from their want of solidity and mass, they sometimes narrowly escape it.

San Micheli's<sup>1</sup> masterpiece is the design of the Palace of the Grimani

<sup>1</sup> Born 1484; died 1549.



—now the Post-office (Woodcut No. 6). It does not appear to have been quite finished at his death, in 1549, but substantially it is his, and, though not so pleasing as some of the earlier palaces, is a stately and appropriate building. It would, perhaps, have been better if the lower Order had been omitted altogether; and the division of the square openings in the upper storeys, by the cornice of the smaller Order being carried across them, is not a very intelligible feature. These, however, are minor defects, and are scarcely worthy of being remarked upon, when compared with the blemishes that can be pointed out in the works of other architects of the same period. The proportions of the whole façade are good, and its dimensions, 92 ft. wide by 98 in height, give it a dignity which renders it one of the most striking façades on the Grand Canal, while the judgment displayed in the design elevates it into being one of the best buildings of the age in which it was erected.


The great Cornaro Palace, commenced in 1532 from designs by Sansovino,<sup>1</sup> is somewhat larger in dimensions, and richer in detail. Its width is 104 feet, its height to the top of the cornice 97; and there is a quantity of ornamental sculpture introduced into the spandrels of the arches, and elsewhere, which might as well have been omitted. The rustication of the base, however, gives dignity to the whole, but the coupling of all the pillars of the upper storeys is productive of a great amount of monotony, which is added to by the repetition of similar arcades throughout the two upper storeys, without any grouping in the centre or any solid masses at the angles. The insertion also of oval windows in the frieze of the crowning cornice detracts very much from the dignity of the design. These defects, however, are very far redeemed by the beauty of its details and the general grandeur of the whole design.<sup>2</sup>

The masterpiece of this architect at Venice is the Library in the Piazzetta, opposite the Doge's Palace. It consists of a lower open arcade of the Doric order, treated with great boldness, and with a well-designed entablature. Above this is a glazed arcade of the Ionic order, surmounted by an entablature of most disproportionate dimensions. This defect is partly redeemed by the motive being apparent, which was, to admit of the introduction of a range of windows in the frieze. If an architect must use an Order, such adaptations may be regarded as traits of genius in so far as he individually is concerned, but they only tend to make more glaring the defects of the principle which forces him to such makeshifts. Notwithstanding this and some minor defects, principally arising from too profuse a use of sculptured decorations, there is a grandeur in the range of twenty-one similar arcades extending through 270 feet, and a boldness in its crowning members, which is singularly pleasing; and if the architect would only let us forget that he was

<sup>1</sup> Born 1479; died 1570.

<sup>2</sup> The Army and Navy Club Pall Mall, is practically a copy of this palace; the

middle story being omitted, and some ornaments introduced which are not in the original.



64

End Elevation of Library of St. Mark, Venice. From Cicognara.

thinking of the Flavian Amphitheatre, we must admit his design to be one of the most beautiful of its age and style.

Beautiful as this building is, and well worthy of study for its own sake, it is still more so from the position in which it happens to be placed. Situated exactly facing the Doge's Palace, and of nearly the same dimensions in plan, it is also so nearly similar in design that nowhere is so favourable an opportunity offered for judging of the comparative merits of the two styles as in this instance. If not quite, they are at least among, the very best specimens of their respective



classes. The Palace, it is true, gains immensely in dignity by the mass superimposed on its arcades ; so that its dimensions rather overpower the Library ; but, on the other hand, the dimensions of the arcades of the Library so much exceed those of the Palace as to restore the equilibrium, to some extent at least.

In analyzing Sansovino's design, the great defect appears to be that the architectural ornament is not necessarily part of the construction. It is, nevertheless, so well managed here that it nowhere seems opposed to it ; still it is felt that it might be away, or another class of ornamentation used, and the building not only stand, but perhaps look as well, or better. More than this, there is a quantity of sculptured ornament, figures in the spandrels, boys and wreaths in the frieze, and foliage elsewhere, which not only is not construction, but does not even suggest it. If all this were omitted, the building would be relieved from that confusion of parts which is one of its principal defects ; or, if enrichment were necessary, more conventional architectural ornament would have attained the same end ; and if it could have been made to suggest construction, so much the better.

In the arcades of the Palace there is not one single feature or one single moulding which is not either construction, or does not suggest it. The sculptured enrichments are entirely subordinate to the architecture, and truthfulness pervades every part. Although, therefore, its scale of parts is smaller, and its features generally less elegant, it is so essentially architecture, and nothing else, that judgment must probably be given in favour of the arcades of the Palace, when weighed fairly against those of the Library ; though a very little more sobriety and taste on the part of the architect of the latter might have turned the scales the other way.

It is evident that the extraordinary depth of the upper entablature of the Library is not the worst defect of the building, for when Scamozzi<sup>1</sup> undertook, in 1584, to continue the two lower ranges along the whole south side of the Piazza di San Marco, he cut down this entablature to within the prescribed limits, and substituted a full-grown storey of the Corinthian order instead. Though the additional height was necessary in this instance, and ought to have increased the dignity of the building, the substitution did not improve the design, and the want of a sufficiently important crowning cornice is felt painfully in this, as it is in most of the designs of this age. There are also some minor defects of detail, which render this, as they do most of Scamozzi's designs, inferior to those of Sansovino. These, however, were, "as must be confessed, faults more of the age than of the architect.

Palladio did not build any palace at Venice of sufficient importance to be quoted as an example of his style ; but the courts of the Convent

<sup>1</sup> Born 1552 ; died 1616.

de la Carita are so favourite a design of his own, and so much praised by his admirers, that it cannot be passed over in silence. The principal court is, or rather was intended to be, surrounded by a double arcade of considerable dimensions, and, like all his designs, elegant in detail and pleasing in general proportions. Above these is a third storey, with square windows between Corinthian pilasters. As here used, this cannot be said to be objectionable; though placing the more solid over the lighter parts of the design is hardly ever a desirable mode of proceeding. The other court was to have had four tall Corinthian pillars on each side, supporting what was supposed to be the reproduction of a hypæthral roof. The sides of the court were plain, but showed two storeys of windows, and the eight great pillars must have so dwarfed its dimensions as to render it almost as clumsy a design as ever was perpetrated; it was, in fact, one of the many instances in which either his own taste or the spirit of his age forced Palladio to adopt the Michael-Angelesque mania for an exaggerated Order; without considering either the exigencies of the building to which it was to be applied, or its dwarfing effect on other parts of the design. Fortunately for Venice, there is no other instance of this perverted taste in any of the civil or domestic buildings of the great age.


The façade of the Prison towards the Canal, commenced in 1589, is a much-admired design by Antonio da Ponte,<sup>1</sup> though there is very little merit in it beyond an absence of that bad taste which began to display itself about this age. The design has also the defect—then becoming too common—of having no reference to the intention of the building to which it is applied; the elevation would be more suitable to a library or a club, or any civil building, than to a prison. This design contrasts, however, pleasingly with its pendant, the Zecca, commenced shortly after the year 1535, from the designs of Sansovino, though it is very unworthy of his fame. The rustication of the Orders, coupled with the great size of the openings, give it an incongruous character, singularly destructive of architectural effect.

One of the best known buildings of the declining age of Venetian Art is the Dogana (Woodcut No. 34), which stands at the entrance of the Grand Canal, and was built by some unknown architect in the seventeenth century (1682?). Whatever may be its defects of style in detail, there is no building in Europe more happily designed to suit the spot in which it stands, or which is better proportioned to the surrounding objects. With these merits it would be difficult for an architect not to produce a building that must be more pleasing than many that are more correct.

To this last and declining age belong the churches of the Salute (Woodcut No. 34) and Zobenigo (Woodcut No. 40), already spoken of

<sup>1</sup> Born 1512; died 1597.





55.

Pesaro Palace, Venice. From a drawing by Canaletti.

above, and a large number of palaces, more remarkable for their richness of decoration than for the propriety of their designs. Still they are palaces, and palaces only. They are rich, striking, and generally placed not only where they can be seen to advantage, but where also they group pleasingly with the objects in their immediate vicinity. Two of the best of these are the Pisano and Rezzonico Palaces; but the most

typical example is perhaps the Pesaro, built by Longhena<sup>1</sup> (the façade of which is shown in Woodcut No. 55), though over ornamented, has no striking faults, such as two storeys being run into one, or anything added for show or merely for effect. Though not in the purest taste, it still perfectly expresses the fact that it is the residence of a wealthy and luxurious noble, and is, taken as a whole, a singularly picturesque piece of Palatial Architecture. It will not stand comparison with the Vandramini or the earlier palaces of Venice for either purity of design or beauty of detail, and there is an absence of repose in any part, which detracts very much from the effect it might otherwise produce. The last defect would have been nearly avoided if there had been only one window on each side of the central group of three, instead of the two which we now find there, and the basement might have been made more solid without probably detracting from convenience. Still, from the water-line to the cornice, it is a rich, varied, and appropriate design, so beautiful as a whole that we can well afford to overlook any slight irregularities in detail.

There are in Venice one or two specimens of modern palatial art, erected within the limits of this century, but so cold, so lean, and unartistic, that we can well pardon the gorgeous—it may be half-barbaric—splendour of the previous age when we compare its production with those of the soulless mediocrity that followed. Fortunately the modern buildings in Venice are few and far between, or the spell that renders it the most beautiful and the most romantic city of Europe might be broken. It is also the city where Domestic and Palatial Architecture can be studied to the greatest advantage. Florence presents only one form of the art, and that confined to one century. The Romans soon lost what little originality they ever had, but Venice, from the 12th to the 18th century, presents an uninterrupted series of palaces and smaller residences, all more or less ornamental, all appropriate to their purposes, and all in exact conformity with the prevailing feelings and taste of the age in which they were erected.

While other Italian cities have each some ten or twelve prominent structures on which their claim to architectural fame is based, Venice numbers her specimens by hundreds; and the residence of the simple citizen is often as artistic as the palace of the proudest noble. No other city possesses such a school of Architectural Art as applied to domestic purposes; and if we must look for types from which to originate a style suitable to our modern wants, it is among the Venetian examples of the early part of the 16th century that we shall probably find what is best suited to our purposes.

---

<sup>1</sup> Born about 1602; died 1682.



## III.—ROME.

The history of secular architecture in Rome differs in many respects from that of either Florence or Venice. So prosperous and so proud was Florence at the end of the thirteenth century, that she instructed her architect to prepare designs for a cathedral "of such extent and magnificence that nothing superior or more beautiful should remain to be desired from the power or industry of man ;"<sup>1</sup> and from that time till the Renaissance she went on increasing in prosperity and power, and adorning the city with such buildings as those described above.

After the war of Chiozza in 1380, Venice was the proudest and the richest commercial city of the world, and her merchant princes lined her canals with their picturesque Gothic palaces, which still excite such admiration in their decay, while they testify to a degree of wealth and luxury utterly unknown to any other city of Europe in that age.

During the whole of the fourteenth century Rome was distracted by the contests of the Orsini and Colonna families, and by the disturbances consequent on the short-lived triumph of Cola Rienzi. These and the series of tumults which forced the Popes into a long banishment at Avignon, had so reduced the city that, at their return, in 1375, they found less than 17,000 inhabitants remaining in the capital. It required a century of repose before her princes recovered sufficiently from these disastrous times to have money to spare for architectural embellishments, and we consequently find her more deficient than almost any city of Italy in examples of Civil or Domestic Architecture of the Mediæval period. Rome possesses no buildings that can compare with the stern grandeur of the Florentine palaces, or the playful luxuriousness of those that adorn the canals of Venice.

The two earliest secular buildings of any importance in Rome are the so-called palaces of Venice : the great palace, with the church of St. Mark adjoining, built about the year 1468 by Giuliano de Majano<sup>2</sup> —the smaller by Baccio Pintelli,<sup>3</sup> in 1475. No buildings could well be more characteristic of the times in which they were erected, for externally they possess no architectural decoration whatever, being heavy machicolated masses, designed for use and defence, but certainly not for ornament ; and it is only their courtyards that bring them into the class of objects of which we are now treating. These are adorned with colonnades in two storeys, supporting arches : and the capitals of the columns, the archivolts, and the whole of the details are so elegant and appropriate that we cannot but feel that their architects were in the right path ; and, had they persevered in using Classical elegance

<sup>1</sup> Giovanni Villani, 'Storia Fiorentina.'

<sup>2</sup> Born 1407 ; died 1477.

<sup>3</sup> Born at Florence beginning of fifteenth century.

without more direct copying than is found in this example, they might have produced a style as original as it would have been elegant. This, however, was probably impossible in a city like Rome, so full of the remains of

"The dead but sceptred sovereigns who still rule  
Our spirits from their urns."

Except these two palaces, and some alterations and repairs, there is nothing that was done during the fifteenth century that need arrest the student of Architecture in Rome, in so far as the civil branch of the art is concerned; so that, practically, its history in this respect commences with the works of the great Florentine artists, Bramante, Peruzzi, Sansovino, Sangallo, and Michael Angelo, who were attracted to Rome by the splendid patronage and magnificent designs which have immortalised the age of Julius II. and Leo X. Practically therefore as concerns Rome we may consider Bramante as the earliest architect of the Renaissance, and the year 1506, when he commenced the Sora Palace, as the earliest date to start from.


The greatest work of Civil Architecture of this age was the Belvedere Court of the Vatican, proposed by Julius II., to unite two detached portions of the Palace, and commenced in 1506 from the designs of Bramante. The ground between those two buildings was very uneven and irregular; but all difficulties were surmounted with a degree of taste and skill which has seldom been surpassed. As originally designed, it consisted of a grand courtyard nearly 1100 ft. in length by 225 ft. in width. At the lower end, next St. Peter's, was an amphitheatre about 150 ft. in diameter, with raised steps, from which shows and spectacles in the courtyard could be conveniently seen, and on each side there were galleries in three storeys, open on the side towards the court, surmounted by a fourth storey pierced only with windows. A little more than half-way from the amphitheatre, a double terrace, with magnificent flights of steps, led to a garden on a level with the floor of the upper arcade, which, with the upper storey, were alone continued round it; and beyond this was the magnificent alcove of the Belvedere, with an open semicircular colonnade on its roof.

The buildings of this court were carried on with such inconsiderate haste that their foundations failed before they were completed, and the requisite strengthening by no means added to their beauty. Its proportions also have now been entirely spoiled by the transverse gallery of the Vatican Library being built on the lower terrace, dividing it into two courts. This arrangement not only destroys all that was grand in the original conception of the court, but renders the two great niches or alcoves at the ends disproportioned to the smaller courts in which they now stand. Other alterations have since taken place, which render the original design scarcely recognisable.

The other great court of the Vatican, known as the Court of the



Loggie, is also ascribed to Bramante, and it seems nearly certain that he commenced it, though it was most probably carried out architecturally, as it certainly was painted, by Raphael, and—like the neighbouring Sistine Chapel, and many other buildings of the age—it owes its fame and its merits far more to the fancy of the painter than to the skill of the architect. If Painting really is, for this purpose, a higher art than Architecture, and this is a legitimate application of it, these two buildings must be considered as the *chefs-d'œuvre* of Italian Art in this age ; but in both cases it seems as if Painting had encroached unreasonably on the domains of her sister Art, and both have suffered in consequence. The Loggie, however, have suffered far less in this respect than the Chapel, for they were not capable of any higher class of



56.

Part of the Façade of the Cancelleria at Rome. From Letarouilly.

adornment, whereas the Chapel afforded a field for architectural display which has been painfully neglected.<sup>1</sup>

Two other very celebrated works of Bramante at Rome are the Palazzo Giraud and the Cancelleria. Both are so similar in style that an illustration from one will suffice, as it shows all the beauties and defects of his style. If we are to judge from it of what St Peter's would have been had the architect's design been carried out, we may feel assured that, like all he did, it would have been free from bad taste, elegant and classical, but not distinguished by any grandeur of conception in its parts, or any great originality of detail. So small indeed are all the parts and proportions of his buildings, that we cannot help suspecting that what is great in the conception of St. Peter's was due to the Pope rather than to his architect. He certainly was so bad a builder that the task he left to his successors was first to pull

<sup>1</sup> See Introduction, pp. 10 to 17.

down and then to rebuild, before they could complete any of his works which he left unfinished.

The façade of the Cancellaria measures 300 ft. in length, 85 ft. 6 in. in height to the top of the cornice, and is divided into three great storeys, or rather divisions—the lower rusticated, the two upper ornamented by pilasters, very much in the manner of the Rucellai Palace at Florence (Woodcut No. 49), but not so successfully. Here the Order is so widely spaced, and, owing to the introduction of pedestals to each of the pillars, so small, as to become comparatively insignificant, and merely ornamental, without any pretence of structural propriety, and the introduction of a second storey in the upper division further detracts from the truthfulness of the whole. Notwithstanding these defects, there is an elegance about the details, and an absence of anything offensively misplaced or vulgar, which renders it an extremely pleasing design; and we dwell on its beauties with the more pleasure because we feel that we are so nearly approaching the dreadful vulgarities of Michael Angelo, which were perpetuated so soon after the time of Bramante.

Next in age and importance to Bramante was Baldassare Peruzzi,<sup>1</sup> who, between the years 1510 and 1534, built some ten or twelve palaces in Rome. One of the most elegant of these is the Farnesina, a villa not far from the great Farnese Palace, but on the other side of the Tiber. Its principal front is recessed between two projecting wings of the same design, the whole consisting of two storeys of arcades with pilasters between, and with a deep frieze to the upper Order, into which are introduced little square windows; thus making it, on a smaller scale, not unlike Sansovino's design for the Library at Venice. Like many of the buildings of this age, the Farnesina is more celebrated for its frescoes, representing the Loves of Cupid and Psyche, after the designs of Raphael, than for its architectural design, which, though elegant, can hardly be said to be remarkable either for taste or grandeur.


A still more celebrated design of his is the Pietro Massimi Palace, which shows considerable ingenuity of adaptation to an irregular site. Many pleasing effects are also gained internally by its being combined with the Angelo Massimi Palace, and the variety arising from these being placed at different angles the one from the other; but beyond the study and ingenuity which this combination displays, and the general elegance of the details, there is nothing very remarkable in the design, nor that would attract much attention anywhere else. The Ossoli Palace (1525) is a better, but a tamer design, and certainly unworthy of the fame it has acquired. Peruzzi, like Bramante, seldom offends by vulgarity, and, building, as he did,

<sup>1</sup> Born 1481; died 1536.



among the ruins of ancient Rome, his details are generally good and elegant; but his style is a painful contrast to the grandeur of that of Florence, or the richness of the contemporary buildings at Venice.

We turn therefore with pleasure to the great Farnese Palace, commenced in 1530, by Antonio da Sangallo,<sup>1</sup> which, taking it with all its faults, is still one of the grandest palatial designs in Italy. In the first place, its dimensions are most imposing, as it consists of an immense cubical mass, 260 ft. on the side by 192 in front, and its three great storeys reach 97 ft. to the top of the cornice. Besides these dimensions, there is a simplicity in the design which is only surpassed by the great Florentine examples. On the front and flanks the lower storey is almost too plain, consisting merely of a range of square-headed windows, broken in the centre of the front by a rusticated arched *porte-cochère*. On the principal floor the windows in the centre are grouped together to such an extent as to give rather an appearance of weakness, considering the great mass over them. Above this Sangallo seems—from some drawings which have been preserved—to have designed a less important storey, crowned by a complete Corinthian entablature, the dimensions of which were determined by pilasters at the angles, running through the two upper storeys. At this point Michael Angelo was called in, and designed the cornice, which is the pride of the building, and the grandest architectural feature in



57. Block Plan of the Farnese Palace at Rome.  
Scale 100 feet to 1 inch.

modern Rome. Its projection and dimensions are such as would be appropriate to an Order running through all the three storeys; but, fortunately, the pilasters which Sangallo suggested, and the architrave, are omitted, and it thus becomes a noble cornice, without any imitative classicality. While we have to thank this great man for this feature, it is feared that we owe to him the upper range of round-headed windows, which are as vulgar and as bad in design as anything that was ever done, and are here totally inexcusable. There was more than sufficient height to have carried the entablature of the Order which adorns the windows across them above the opening, without breaking it; but merely to insert a block of it over the pillars, and

<sup>1</sup> Born 1470; died 1546.

run the arches into the pediment, was a most unpardonable mistake in such a situation.

The original design contemplated two courts, and from this cause, apparently, the garden front was left unfinished, which enabled Giacomo della Porta to insert the central compartment in three arcades, which, though pleasing in itself, is inappropriate here, and to a great extent mars a design with which it might easily have been brought into harmony by a slightly bolder treatment.

This is, nevertheless, the façade chosen for illustration (Woodcut No. 58), inasmuch as it brings into instructive contrast the two great principles of design then in vogue in Rome—the Astylar, which may also be called the Florentine style, and the Arcaded, or “Amphitheatral”—if such a word may be introduced—which may be designated the Roman. For external purposes, there can be no doubt but



58. Garden front to the Farnese Palace, Rome. Scale 100 feet to 1 inch. From Le Boulton's.

that the former was by far the most suitable. It could not indeed be used with the same simplicity as is found in the Farnese or at Florence, except in buildings on as large a scale; but it could easily have been ornamented by panellings, mouldings, and window-dressings, till it was *petite* enough for suburban villas, without ever losing its propriety of proportion. The other, or Arcaded style, was equally suitable for courtyards, especially in such a climate as Italy, but never could attain the dignity of the Astylar as an external mode of decorative art.

The courtyard of the Farnese is an exact square in plan, 90 ft. each way, and is surrounded by bold and deep arcades in three storeys, the upper one, as usual, filled in with windows. The whole is very grand, and not inappropriate to the bold simplicity of the exterior; but its effect is considerably marred by the vulgar and fantastic details in which Michael Angelo revelled, and which, though excusable with his style of painting, are most destructive of architectural effect. It is impossible, indeed, to help perceiving that the



brush, and not the square and rule, was the instrument with which all his designs were made. All these fantastic contrasts, which may be necessary for architectural decoration painted on a flat surface, are introduced by him, both here and elsewhere, in hard stone in relief. The effect is not only most unpleasing in his own designs, but was fatal in the school of imitators who with less genius sought to follow his example.

Sangallo's other two great palaces—the Palma, built in 1506, and the Sacketti, in 1540—are characterized by all the good taste and extreme simplicity of design which is found in his part of the Farnese. To such an extent did he carry this, that it may almost be said to amount to baldness in Palatial Architecture, though it might be appropriate in works of a more monumental character.

Sansovino did very little in Rome, and that little is not remarkable for any striking qualities. His contemporary, Giulio Romano<sup>1</sup>—



59.

Museum in the Capitol at Rome. From Letarouilly.

almost the only architect of this age who was a native of Rome—built several palaces, and introduced in his buildings the same weak, tricky style which characterizes his painting. An exception ought perhaps to be made in favour of the Villa Madama, which, if neither very grand nor beautiful, is at least free from bad taste, and has some pleasing points of design.

There are several palaces in Rome the designs of which are attributed to Raphael, but which may more probably belong to Giulio Romano, or some other of his contemporaries. This is of little consequence; for though it is certain Raphael did sketch designs for palaces, it is not so clear that he ever practically carried them out; and at a period when so much was borrowed from the Classical ages, and so little really invented by the artist, there was not much left for the architect but the arrangement of the parts. There was, consequently, but little scope for Raphael's peculiar talent for gentle

<sup>1</sup> Born 1492; died 1546.

elegance, while the robust but somewhat vulgar energy of his great rival made itself everywhere felt.

The only great group of Civic buildings in Rome which display Michael Angelo's taste in design, are those in the Capitol. It is true the Palace of the Senators, commenced by him in 1563, was finished by another hand after his death, but the Museum and the Palace of the Conservatori are entirely his. They were commenced about the year 1542, and are early specimens of the style of Corinthian pilasters running through two storeys, which afterwards became so fashionable, and, it must be admitted, are used here with a vigour which goes far to redeem the impropriety of their introduction. The details of the windows are better than is usual in this artist's works, and the whole bears the impress of the hand of a giant in Art, but tinctured with that vulgarity from which giants, it is feared, are seldom, if ever, free.

Giacomo Barozzi da Vignola,<sup>1</sup> one of the most celebrated architects of this period, not only adorned Rome with some of its most elegant buildings, but, with his contemporary, Palladio,<sup>2</sup> may be said to have completed the first period of the Renaissance. During the half-century that preceded their advent, the last remnant of Gothic feeling had been banished from Italy, and the whole tendency of the age was towards a revival of the Classic style. The architects of this epoch, however, had by no means consented to a system of literal copying, but hoped, out of the details and elegancies of Classic Art, to create a new and original style, adapted to their own purposes.

From long and enthusiastic study of the great remnants of antiquity, these two men became so imbued with admiration for the works they were studying, that they never afterwards could emancipate themselves from the feeling that Classical Art alone was worthy of study, and that it could not be imitated with too great minuteness, or reproduced with too great exactness. Having in consequence thoroughly mastered the subject of their studies, they devoted their lives to forwarding what seemed to them so all-important,<sup>3</sup> and, both by their writings and their practice, they sought, and with ill-fated success, to fix the principles of their art on the basis of this literal reproduction of the great models of antiquity. Not only did they fix the exact proportions of each of the so-called "Orders," and the profile of every

<sup>1</sup> Born 1507; died 1573.

<sup>2</sup> Born 1518; died 1580.

<sup>3</sup> Modern architects, by study of mediæval cathedrals, &c., have arrived at precisely the same stage of fascination with their beauties which their predecessors of the sixteenth century reached in regard to Classic Art. They would of

course feel indignant if told that their illicit affections must share the same fate as those of the Palladian school; but it is as certain that the reaction is not far off as that we are now a civilized people, and cannot consequently permanently admire barbarisms, nor be content with servile imitations.






60.

Villa of Pope Julius, near Rome. From Letaroudily.

moulding, but they established canons for the superposition of Orders on one another, and, in short, fixed on the Renaissance those principles which gave it its distinctive character, but which also insured its eventual decay. The human mind cannot rest satisfied without progress, and where the main principles of an art are fixed by arbitrary rules beyond appeal, men are driven to *bizarreries* in detail, in order to produce new effects, and the incongruities between the parts become daily more and more apparent. This was not felt in the age of Vignola and Palladio, whose works, though generally tame, are always elegant, and by the correctness of their Classical details disarm the critic, who is bound to judge of them by the standard according to which they were designed.


At Rome Vignola was not fortunate in having any great work to design and carry out entirely by himself, though many of the palaces owe some of their greatest beauties to his assistance. There are several small palaces, one especially in the Piazza Navona, which display all the elegance of proportion and beauty of detail which distinguish this architect. His best work, however, is perhaps the villa of Pope Julius, outside the Flaminian Gate. He did not complete the whole, but the façade (Woodcut No. 60) is certainly his, and displays those peculiarities of design which produced such an effect throughout



61.

Plan of the Palace of Caprarola. Scale 100 feet to 1 inch

Europe that every detail of this building may be found repeated over and over again on this side of the Alps. There is not perhaps much grandeur or any very remarkable feature about this design, but there is an entire absence of bad taste or of any false principles, which in that age is great praise. Another small summer-house, called the



62

Palace of Caprarola, near Rome.



Vigna, attached to this villa, is also partly of his design, and the two together form perhaps the most elegant specimen of villa architecture that Italy can boast of. If there is not the same amount of elaboration in these as is found in any design of true Art, it is simply that they are little more than one man's contribution of thought—a real Classical or Mediaeval design includes that of hundreds. If architects of that age had been content to follow the path pointed out in such designs as these, the defect would very soon have been remedied, but to do so would have required an amount of self-denial which was hardly to be expected, and certainly was not obtained.

Vignola's great work, however, and that by which he is best known, is the Palace of Caprarola, which he built, some thirty miles from Rome, for the Cardinal Alessandro Farnese. The plan is unique, or nearly so, being a pentagon, enclosing a circular court.



63.

Façade of the Collegio della Sapienza. From Letarouilly.

Each of the five sides measures 130 ft. on plan, and the court is 65 ft. in diameter, while the three storeys are each about 30 ft. in height: so that its dimensions are very considerable, and certainly quite sufficiently so for palatial purposes. The object of adopting the form here used, was to give it a fortified or castellated appearance, as all citadels of that age were pentagons, and this palace is accordingly furnished with small sham bastions at each angle, which are supposed to suggest that idea of defensibility so dear to the builder of castellated mansions at the present day. Above the terrace formed by these bastions and their curtains, the palace rises in two grand storeys of "Orders," the lower arcaded in the centre, the upper including two storeys of windows. This last is certainly a defect, but, notwithstanding this, the whole is so well designed, the angles are so bold, and the details are so elegant, that it is one of the finest palaces in Italy; and we may admire the ingenuity of the architect the more, because the pentagonal form is singularly unfavourable to architectural-effect externally, or to commodious arrangements inside, and the

site also is such that from most points of view it looks too high for its other dimensions. But all these defects have been overcome in a manner that makes us regret that its architect was not more employed on the great works of his day. At St. Peter's he only added the two small cupolas, one on each side of the dome, and made some slight repairs or improvements to the other great churches of Rome.

The façade of the Collegio della Sapienza, built by Giacomo della Porta, in the year 1575, deserves to be quoted as one of the most successful of its class in Rome, showing how much may be effected by mere justness of proportion and elegance of detail, and as illustrating the value of a solid and unadorned basement to anything that can be



64.

Cortile of the Borghese Palace. From Letarouilly.

placed upon it. Unfortunately such examples are rare, and the temptation to spread pilasters over such a surface has ruined half the façades of Italy.

Of a very different character from this is the Collegio Romano, the façade of which was built in the year 1582, by Bartolomeo Ammanati,<sup>1</sup> and which, though free from the defects of unmeaning Classicality, is designed in a style quite as unconstructive, and far more devoid of elegance; the whole façade being divided into gigantic panels, enclosing groups of windows, but neither representing the external construction nor internal arrangements.

Nearly the same criticism applies, though in a somewhat less degree, to the great Borghese Palace, built from the designs of Martino Lunghi, the elder, about the year 1590. Its courtyard, however, is singularly well proportioned, and a favourable example of what in

<sup>1</sup> Born 1511, died 1592.



most cases is the most pleasing as well as the most characteristic feature of an Italian palace, though it is one that generally admits of less variety of design than any other part. In this instance, however, the objection is obviated by one side of the courtyard being an arcade, only two storeys in height, and opening into the garden, affording a prospect of scenic beauty and variety from the three other sides.

The Laterano Palace (Woodcuts Nos. 31 and 32), built from designs of Dominico Fontana,<sup>1</sup> about this period (1586), is little better than a bad copy of the Farnese; the smaller scale of its parts, and the fact of the cornice being cut up by a range of small square windows inserted in the frieze, destroying entirely the massive dignity of its prototype.



45.

View of the Barberini Palace, Rome. From Letarouilly

The Barberini Palace, in so far as size or richness of detail is concerned, is one of the most remarkable of the Roman Palaces; but unfortunately its architects were Carlo Maderno, Borromini,<sup>2</sup> and Bernini,<sup>3</sup> and it was commenced at a time (1624 to 1630) when Architecture in Rome had already begun to decline, and caprice to take the place of the simplicity of the school of Sangallo, or the purity of that of Vignola. Notwithstanding defects, both in design and detail, the dimensions of this palace are such as to give it an air of magnificence, and its broken outline also renders it more picturesque than most of those of Rome. It may also be added in its praise, that each storey is carefully

<sup>1</sup> Born 1543; died 1607.<sup>2</sup> Born 1599; died 1667.<sup>3</sup> Born 1598; died 1680.

distinguished by its own Order, and it has escaped the bad taste and bad grammar which Michael Angelo rendered fashionable. It may also be remarked that it possesses another merit in common with most of the Roman palaces, of being finished and complete all round. In Venice, as remarked above, even the best façades are generally only *appliquées*; if the design be returned at all, it is only to the extent of one, or at most only two, bays round the corner, and all the rest is mean and commonplace. This is a sad mistake in an architectural point of view, and detracts very considerably from the beauty of the Venetian designs. At Rome, on the contrary, though no one façade may be so rich as those of Venice, the ornament is spread much more equally over the whole, and the buildings acquire an immense degree of dignity and importance from having no mean parts anywhere visible.

It would be tedious to attempt to enumerate all the other palaces or civil buildings which continued to be erected at Rome during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Many are remarkable for their size, several by the richness of their façades, but none of them can be considered either as objects worthy of admiration, or as models to be followed in designing others.

It will be well, therefore (at first at least), to turn to the other cities of Italy which possess buildings of the earlier period of the Renaissance, in order that we may understand what really were the aims of the architects of the period, and see how far they succeeded in attaining to them.

#### IV.—VICENZA.


Vicenza is a city dear to all admirers of the Renaissance style, not only as being the birthplace of Palladio, but as containing by far the greatest number, as well as the most celebrated, productions of his genius. Strange to say, it is not, however, in Vicenza that these can be studied to the greatest advantage, as, unfortunately, most of them are of brick concealed under stucco, and are constructed with wooden architraves, and all the shams we blame so much in the Architecture of the present day. The city, too, is now sunk into decay, and most of its palaces are deserted, so that the buildings themselves have an air of shabby decay most destructive to architectural effect, and are in consequence better studied in drawings, and in the numberless copies of them which exist in this and other countries on this side of the Alps.

An illustration of the Valmarina Palace has already been given (page 42, Woodcut No. 7), as an example of Palladianism in excess. Its defects, however, are even more apparent on the spot than in the drawings, inasmuch as it is situated on one side of a street so narrow that it is impossible to get far enough away to obtain a good view of it.



An architect might be excused for exaggerating his details, if his building were to be placed on one side of a very large piazza, or at the end of a very long vista; but in a narrow street the details of a façade ought to be designed almost as if for an interior—as things which must be seen near, and can only be grasped in detail.

It is probable that the Tiene Palace owes its design, in part at least, to its proprietor. It is, however, always published in Palladio's works,



66. Part of Façade of the Tiene Palace, Vicenza. From Palladio's 'Architettura.'

and generally quoted as one of his most successful designs. All its parts are indeed good in themselves, but they are put together in a manner by no means creditable to the architect. The basement is rusticated with more than Herculean boldness; but when it is perceived—which cannot be concealed—that it is only brick covered with stucco, the effect is far from pleasing, and it is less so when it is considered that this tremendous rustication is only designed to support a range of delicate Corinthian pilasters. Between these, however, are windows, rusticated with all the rudeness of the basement, but again, the whole is crowned by an entablature belonging to the Corinthian Order.

Palladio's taste redeems these incongruities to a certain extent, but it was inexcusable to use such a rustication with the materials employed, and still more so to combine a Corinthian Order with features so little in accordance with its delicate elegance.

Internally the arrangement is better. The arcades of both storeys are well proportioned and elegant, and though it would have been better if the attic could have been omitted, it is well kept under, and therefore as little obtrusive as could be expected.

It is seldom, however, that Palladio confined himself to a single Order in only one storey. In the Valmarina and Barbarano it runs through two: and, as in the court of the Carita at Venice, we find in the Porto Palace in Vicenza,<sup>1</sup> that the court is surrounded by twenty great columns of the Composite Order, supporting, at half their height,



67.

Elevation of Chiericate Palace, Vicenza. From Palladio's 'Architettura.'

a gallery on Corinthian pilasters stuck to their backs. A more common arrangement in Palladio's buildings was to place one Order above the other. In the wings of the Chiericate Palace, where both stand free, this is comparatively unobjectionable; but in the centre, where the upper Order is filled in with windows, and consequently the solids are placed over the voids, the effect is most displeasing. At Vicenza this is, notwithstanding, considered one of Palladio's best designs, and has recently been put into a state of thorough repair, and appropriated as the museum and picture-gallery of the town. It is therefore seen as Palladio designed and finished it, and the result is certainly very unworthy of his fame. A building open and weak at the angles, and solid in the centre, is always unsatisfactory, though the defect occurs in the Valmarina and others of his designs; but when we add to this that

<sup>1</sup> Secondo libro 'Dell' Architettura di a Palladio,' p. 8.



the centre is full above and weak below, we have probably enumerated all the worst elements that can well be introduced into the arrangement of a design. Nothing, in fact, redeems this façade but that exquisite proportion of parts, and that indefinable elegance of detail, which disarm the critic of Palladio's works, and, in spite of the worst possible arrangements, still leave a pleasing impression on the mind of the spectator.

Taking it all in all, the annexed design for the Barbarano Palace perhaps shows Palladio's style to the best advantage. The proportion of the Orders one to another is good, so is that of the solids to the voids, and the whole has a palatial ornamental air, and with as little false decoration as is perhaps compatible with the style. Still it certainly would have been better if the figures over the pediments and the wreaths dependent from the brackets had been omitted; or, if more ornament was desired, panelling or *patere* would have supplied their place as effectually and far more appropriately.

One of this architect's most admired designs is the Rotunda, or Villa del Capra, in the neighbourhood of this city. It is a square of about 70 ft. each way, with an enclosed but projecting portico on



68. Barbarano Palace,<sup>1</sup> Vicenza. From Palladio's 'Architettura.'

each face, of the Ionic order, and having a domical apartment of 30 feet diameter in the centre. It is perhaps the most Classical and temple-like design ever applied to Domestic Architecture, and has in consequence been so much admired that in this country it has been repeated four or five times over; and copies, more or less exact, are found in every country of Europe. It certainly is not suited to domestic purposes, especially in

<sup>1</sup> The exterior of the Porto Palace is almost identical with this, except that the lower Order is omitted.

northern climes; but there is a charm about it which it is impossible to deny, and it possesses as few offences against constructive propriety as any design of the sort which has yet been produced, and may safely be regarded as one of the most successful efforts of this architect's genius. Its situation, too, is such as almost to excuse it from the charge of affectation in applying Temple Architecture to domestic purposes, for it stands on a rounded grassy knoll, seen from below on all sides, and fits most gracefully to its situation. Anything less regular or less monumental would have been out of place there, but the copies of it that exist in this country have none of them this excuse, and without such a site a four-porticoed house must always be more or less an anomaly.

If we take into consideration the difficulties Palladio had to encounter, we must feel that he showed even more talent in the manner



69.

Villa del Capra, near Vicenza From Palladio.

in which he rebuilt the arcades round the Mediæval basilica of his native city than he displayed in works already noticed. In order to understand what he had to do here, it is necessary to cast a glance at the basilica of Padua, which still retains its pointed-arched arcades; and if we compare the two, we shall see at once not only how successfully Palladio adapted the new mode of decoration to the old form, but why the Italians so willingly and so enthusiastically abandoned their Mediæval style for the revived Classical. We, on this side of the Alps had not their excuse, for our Gothic was an elegant and perfect style, theirs an incomplete and clumsy borrowing from the northern nations. So much is this the case, that even now the veriest *fanatics* for Mediæval Art must admit the superiority of the external appearance of the Vicentine over the Paduan basilica as they now stand.

One of the great difficulties Palladio had to contend with was that he was obliged to make one opening of his arcade correspond with two



openings of the hall. This obliged him to widen his arcades more than was quite desirable, but, as they had nothing to carry beyond their own weight, this is comparatively of little consequence : and by breaking the entablature over his principal Order, he made it evident that this was really the case, and that they were merely ornamental. This spreading of the three or seven central arcades enabled him to contract the angle ones, so as to accentuate and give strength exactly where it was wanted, and so to take off all that appearance of weakness which, as noted above, is so common a fault in his designs, and makes the pains he has taken to avoid it here all the more remarkable.

Had Palladio done nothing else than this arcade, his fame would



70.

East Elevation of Basilica at Vicenza. Scale 50 feet to 1 inch.

have stood higher than it does, and justly so : for, taking it all in all, it is perhaps not too much to say that what he added to this great hall is the happiest adaptation of Classical Art to modern purposes which has yet been executed in Europe, and, though not faultless, it is on the whole less open to animadversion than any design of modern times.

If, indeed, all Palladio's designs were as beautiful and as appropriate as this, we should have little fault to find either with the style he adopted or his mode of applying it. But the task he imposed on himself, or rather that his age imposed on him, was one that no human ingenuity could successfully perform : it was to adapt the Temple Architecture of an extinct civilisation to the Ecclesiastical, the Municipal, and Domestic Architecture of his own time. That

he failed is not to be wondered at; on the contrary, he deserves all praise for the extent to which he did succeed. We are always pleased in his works by the evidence of a refined and cultivated mind, joined with the innate perception of proportion and fitness which constitute the architectural faculty. We never see in them the broken pediments or contorted mouldings of Michael Angelo, or the unstructural caprices of Borromini or Guarini. Every feature and every moulding is used apparently for the purpose for which it was designed, and always with elegance; and generally the solids are so well proportioned to the voids that the stability seems perfect, and the proportions of the masses are also generally well balanced. Against all this we have to remark that in nine cases out of ten the construction is one thing, the ornamentation totally distinct from it. This, it is true, was an inherent part of the problem, but, where it exists, true and satisfactory Architecture is impossible. This was not the case with the early Florentine or the early Roman Art, but it became so wherever the Orders were used to the extent and with the importance which Palladio gave them, and which, in fact, is the cause of all the defects of his architecture and of that of his school.

#### V.—GENOA.

No city of Italy is more favourably situated for architectural display than Genoa, and had its advantages been properly availed of, nothing would have been finer than the amphitheatre of palaces which might have arisen around her bay. Unfortunately those which do line its shores and are seen from the sea are all the older and less ornamental buildings, which have in modern times been dreadfully mutilated and disfigured, first to widen the quay, and next to convert them into hotels and to other utilitarian uses, to which they are now almost without exception applied.

No two places in Italy form so marked a contrast in all their principal features as the rival cities of Venice and Genoa. In the first all is flat and levelled by the water-line of her streets; the other hardly possesses a foot of level ground, and half the streets are impassable for carriages, from their steepness. In Venice all is silence and decay; in Genoa all is bustle and noise; and the traveller has difficulty in preventing himself being run over in the principal streets—just wide enough for two carriages to pass, and not sufficiently so to allow *trottoirs* to be abstracted from the carriage-way. The Architecture of the two cities is even more strongly contrasted. Venice is full of Mediæval palaces of most romantic interest; Genoa has not one worthy of notice. When Venice adopted the Renaissance style, she used it with an aristocratic elegance that relieves even its most fantastic forms in the worst age. In Genoa there is a pretentious



parvenu vulgarity in even the best examples, which offends in spite of considerable architectural merit. Their size, their grandeur, and their grouping may force us to admire the palaces of Genoa; but for real beauty, or architectural propriety of design, they will not stand a moment's comparison with the contemporary or earlier palaces of Florence, Rome, or Venice.

The true palatial magnificence of the city is confined to a range of narrow streets at the back of the town—the *Strade Balbi*, *Nuova*, and *Nuovissima*—which in the sixteenth century were added to it. These, with the exception of one or two small, confined *Piazzi*, comprise all that Genoa is most celebrated for; and, though the palaces situated in these places are not perhaps worthy of all the praise that has been lavished on them, they form a splendid group, and have a local individuality and character which render them an interesting study when considered in juxtaposition with the other cities whose buildings have just been alluded to.

Galeazzo Alessi,<sup>1</sup> who was the architect of nine-tenths of the most remarkable buildings of Genoa, had none of the classical elegance of his contemporaries Palladio and Vignola; but his style was also free from the incongruities which their blind admiration of the antique induced them sometimes to introduce into their designs. Being, on the other hand, much more of an architect and less of a painter than Michael Angelo, he never fell into those unconstructive absurdities which disfigure all the buildings of that great man. He never ran gigantic pilasters through two or three storeys, and then stuck attics on the top of them, so as to falsify the construction of the whole.

The real merit of the Genoese palaces is that they really are what they seem. If pilasters are used, they are mere decorations. Pillars are never introduced when not wanted; and, above all, the cornice is always the principal feature of the design, and always at the top of the wall—attics being almost unknown in Genoa; and windows are only introduced when and where they are wanted. With these elements it is difficult to fail; and Alessi only wanted a little more elegance in designing his details, and a little better material to work with, in order to have attained a great success. The last mentioned is, in fact, one of the principal defects of the Genoese buildings, though not the fault of the architect; for, though it is usual for tourists to talk glibly of the marble palaces of Genoa, it is a melancholy fact that, except some of the black and white mediæval edifices, there is not a single façade in the city built wholly of that material.

About one-third of the Genoese palaces are plain buildings of rubble masonry, covered with stucco—the windows without dressings,

<sup>1</sup> Born 1500, died 1572.


and the façade with scarcely an ornamental feature except the porch and the cornices. The intention was, not only to paint the architectural mouldings on the stucco, but to paint frescoes between them. This has been done in many instances, but in some it is so completely



71. Durazzo Palace, Genoa. From Gauthier. Scale 50 feet to 1 inch.

washed off that it is difficult to detect the traces of it: in some it exists in so faded a condition that the subject can hardly be made out: and in others it flares forth in all the staring vulgarity of pretentious newness.

One of the best examples of this style is the Palazzo Durazzo in the Strada Balbi. It is very doubtful whether its painting was ever carried out, and it certainly is better without it. To make a building of this class effective requires considerable dimensions, the openings



72. Torri Doria Palace, Genoa. From Gauthier. Scale 50 feet to 1 inch.

large and as few as possible, and a cornice of bold projection: but with these elements it may be both grand and beautiful, and possess all the principal requirements of architectural excellence. Though as plain and devoid of ornament as it is almost possible for any design to be, this one is as effective and as pleasing as any palace in the city.




In a second class all the ornaments that were painted in the first are carried out in stucco; which is certainly an improvement on paint, but, in the hands of Galeazzo Alessi, is frequently offensive from its vulgarity, though fortunately not from its want of constructive propriety.

The *Municipalita* in the *Strada Nuova*, formerly the *Palazzo Tursi Doria*, is the most admired example of this. The dimensions of this and the *Durazzo Palace* are very nearly identical; their extent, measured from the extremities of the wings, being about 200 feet, their height 85 feet, and their design is also very similar; but the ornaments of the *Municipalita* give it a striking effect of richness and grandeur, which is considerably aided by the narrowness of the street, or rather lane, in which it is situated.

In a third class the dressings of the windows and doorways, and in a few even the string courses, are of marble; but the expense of the material has apparently induced the architects who have used it so to pare down the projections that, instead of being an advantage, the buildings in which it is employed are the least

satisfactory of all. It may be added that a great deal that looks like marble at first sight is in reality merely paint, and by no means well done.

Taken by itself, the most magnificent of the palaces of Genoa is that formerly known as the *Durazzo* (*Marcello*), now the *Royal Palace*, with a façade in the *Strada Balbi* 300 ft. in length. Its style is similar to that of the *Municipalita* (*Woodcut No. 72*), but its height, about 75 ft., is hardly sufficient to its length, and would not be so if



73. Part of Façade of Orsaga Palace, Genoa. From Gauthier.

it could ever be seen in front : but, being, as usual, in a narrow street, this defect is not apparent. Its details are all designed on the largest scale, and the composition of the whole façade so bold, and, it must be added, so honest, that the effect is on the whole satisfactory.

The Ducal Palace was almost entirely rebuilt after the fire in the year 1778, and may be considered as more French than Italian in design. It is, however, a very elegant building, though most of its pillars are only painted marble. Its great hall is the finest room in the city.

One of Alessi's principal works is the Carega Palace, one of the largest, and generally considered one of the handsomest in Genoa, the façade being a square of about 93 ft. in width and height, but divided into seven storeys externally, three being in the basement, two under the lower Order, one under the next, and the last between the consoles of the cornice. Only the architrave of the lower Order is left between the two, and the whole decoration is so evidently applied only to cover a space with which it has no constructive affinity, that the effect is very unsatisfactory.

The Sauli Palace, said to be by the same architect, is more pleasing, as it consists, in the garden front, of two well-defined storeys ornamented with Orders, with arches between. On the lower storey are Doric pillars, and a rich frieze crowns the upper or Corinthian order. Towards the street there is considerable ability displayed in the way the central block is kept back, and the courtyard with its two wings thrown forward to the front. There is, in fact, more light and shade, and more variety of design, in this palace than in any in Genoa ; and, if its details were a little more pure, it might challenge comparison in some respects with any in Italy. The same architect built the Lercari, Grimaldi, and Justiniani Palaces, and, in fact, happening to live at a moment of unwonted prosperity, and when a great extension of the city was taking place in the direction of the Strade Balbi and Nuova, he has left his mark more essentially on the place than any of his successors.

In addition to other peculiarities, it may be mentioned that many of the greater palaces of the city are painted red ; some green, some blue, and a great many yellow. All this produces in that climate a rich and sparkling effect, very taking at first sight ; though it can hardly be denied that using coloured materials must be a more legitimate mode of producing an architectural effect, than merely painting the mouldings on plaster. The fact is that the imposing appearance of these palaces is mainly due to the situations in which they are found. Nothing can well be more startling than to see six, eight, or ten great palaces, each standing separately, in a street barely 36 ft. in width, or to find in narrow lanes and small courts, great palatial masses six and seven storeys in height, covered with orna-



ment, and crowned by massive cornices, while you stand so close beneath that their effect is doubled by the angle under which they are seen.

By far the most beautiful features of the greater palaces of Genoa are their courtyards, though these, architecturally, consist of nothing but ranges of arcades, resting on attenuated Doric pillars. These are generally of marble, sometimes grouped in pairs, and too frequently with a block of an entablature over each under the springing of the arch; but, notwithstanding these defects, a cloistered court is always and inevitably pleasing, even if not beautiful in detail, and, if combined with gardens and scenery beyond, which is generally the case in this city, the effect, as seen from the streets, is so poetic as to disarm criticism. All that dare to be said is that, beautiful as they are, with a



74.

Little Brignola Palace, Genoa. From Gauthier.

little more taste and judgment they might have been ten times more so than they are now.

A more pleasing class of design than the greater buildings just described are the smaller palaces, such as the Balbi, Mari, and Little Brignola, each with seven windows in front, three recessed in the centre, and two in each wing,—in the two first-named palaces projecting in front of the centre, and carried only to the height of the principal storey, and, consequently, with a terrace roof; but whether so used or not, the whole forms a most pleasing composition, peculiar to Genoa, and exhibiting her style of Architecture under its most pleasing aspect. But even these are not such as would escape criticism elsewhere, or would be tolerated if erected at the present day.

Taking it altogether, the study of the Palatial Architecture of Genoa is as instructive as that of any other city of Italy, though neither so beautiful nor so interesting as that of several others. The Genoese

palaces are remarkable, first, for their size, and the largeness of their parts—qualities which are immensely exaggerated by the narrowness of the streets and courts in which they are situated. They have also the immense advantage of standing free, each by itself, but still in close proximity to the next; thus the grouping produces an effect of magnificence in the whole which adds to the importance of each; and they are also, as a rule, free from any attempt to imitate or reproduce Classical or any other models.

Against these must be placed the badness of the material, the coarseness and frequently the incongruity of the details, and that sometimes their architecture is either only painted in, or accentuated by paint, with a crudeness very closely approaching to vulgarity. If, in addition to these defects, the "Orders" had been allowed to govern the designs to the extent they were made to do so in other cities, the effect would have been most painful; but because they are palaces, and palaces only, and because their windows, their doors, and, above all, their cornices, are in their right places, and in due subordination to one another, all these defects are overlooked, and the impression the Genoese palaces generally produce is one of almost unmitigated admiration.

## VI.—MANTUA.

The Palazzo del Té has acquired such celebrity that it is impossible to pass it over in a History of Architecture; but no building ever less merited its fame than it does. Originally it was intended as a stable, or rather as a sort of hunting-box outside the walls of Mantua; and Giulio Romano was employed, most appropriately, by the Marquis Frederigo Gonzaga, to paint portraits of his favourite horses on the walls of the only large apartment the building then possessed. The Marquis was, it seems, so pleased with the result of the experiment, that the palace was extended to what we now see it, and all the principal rooms adorned with frescoes by Giulio or his pupils. Though these are as vulgar as most of the productions of this overrated artist, it may be that they entitle the building to some of the notoriety it has acquired; but its architecture certainly is such that, if found elsewhere, and under another name, no one would turn to look at it.

The building is nearly a square, externally 180 ft. by 186 ft., and 30 ft. in height to the top of the cornice. It is rusticated throughout in coarse stucco, and, besides this, its only ornament consists in a range of mean Doric pilasters, spread sparsely over the surface, and surmounted by a Doric entablature of very ordinary design. Between these pilasters are two ranges of windows, the lower ones of fair dimensions, and, above these, a range of square attic-looking openings.



Throughout half the palace these last are mere shams, the principal rooms occupying the whole height of the building, where one range consequently only was required, and had it been adopted might have given a dignity to the design, in which it is now so sadly deficient.

Internally, the building surrounds a court of the same design, about 120 ft. square, from which a loggia leads, across a bridge, into a garden with architectural embellishments. This loggia is, in fact, the only architectural feature of any merit in the whole building. Its proportions are good, its ornaments well designed, and the colours judiciously applied, but it is very small, and only in stucco. The charm of the palace, in so far as Architecture is concerned, depends on the coffering and colouring of the ceilings, which display an amount of design, and of fancy combined with elegance, seldom seen elsewhere, and consequently worthy of all praise, but they will not suffice to redeem the building from the reproach of being, externally at least, of the tamest commonplace as an architectural design. If we assume that painting is the proper mode of ornamenting interiors, it is the painter, not the architect, that must decide how far this is or is not a successful specimen of the art. But this does not affect the criticism that may be applied to the exterior, which is only coarsely yellow-washed, and is not entitled to the admiration generally bestowed upon it by those who admire the works of the painter in the halls it encloses.

If Giulio Romano was forced to tame his fancies in the design of this structure, he gave full rein to them in the design of the façade of the Palazzo Colloredo in this city, which he adorned with gigantic caryatides, of the vulgarest and most fantastic design conceivable. Nothing that Michael Angelo ever did was so exaggerated as this. With all his faults, he never employed great grotesque figures in stucco as a means of producing an effect appropriate to a nobleman's palace in the street of a city.

When such things were done so early in the age of the Renaissance, one cannot but feel grateful to Palladio, and others of his school, for bringing back Art within the bounds of moderation ; for, however tame some of their designs may be, the worst of them is better than such a nightmare of vulgarity as we find in this and some other of the designs of the early part of the sixteenth century.<sup>1</sup>

## VII.—MILAN.

During the whole of the Renaissance period Milan continued to be one of the most important and richest cities of Northern Italy ; perhaps even relatively more so than during the Mediæval period, during which, however, she was able to erect the finest Gothic Church in Italy. Yet,

<sup>1</sup> Giulio Romano died in 1546.

strange to say, there is scarcely any city in that country so deficient in examples of architectural magnificence as Milan continued to be during the whole of this period. She produced no architect, gave fame or name to none, and does not possess any specimens of Renaissance Art on which we dwell with pleasure, or love to quote, as calling up reminiscences of beauty; the one obvious exception to this being the great court of the Ospedale Grande, which is one of the most remarkable buildings of its class of that, or indeed of any age.

It was commenced in the year 1456, by Francesco Sforza and his wife Bianca, nearly on the scale on which we now see it completed, but



75.

Great Court of the Hospital at Milan. From a Photograph.

they only lived to finish the northern wing, consisting of four courts comprised in a square, of about 340 ft. each way. Considering the age at which it was erected, the design is much more Mediæval than might be expected, especially from a Florentine architect like Filarete, who was its author. All the external windows are pointed, and adorned with quasi-Gothic mouldings, and internally the arcades that surround the courts partake much more of Mediæval than they do of Renaissance design. They are so built up now, and so disfigured by additions, that it is difficult to judge of their effect, but enough can still be made out to show that, when new, these courts must have been as appropriate



to their purposes as they were effective in an architectural point of view.

To the northern face of this block Bramante added a portico or corridor of the Ionic order, bearing arches, and he may either have added a portion of the upper corridor, or at least left the design for it; but there the matter rested till the year 1621, when, a large sum of money having been left to the charity by a Dr. Carcano, the architect Richini was employed to erect the central court. With a degree of taste and modesty as commendable as it is unusual, he resolved to complete Bramante's design round the three other sides, and this is done so literally that, except the window-dressings and some other details, in which we detect the seventeenth century, the whole design of the court may be ascribed to Bramante. It is by far the finest thing of its kind in Italy. In Spain there are some that equal, if they do not surpass it; but, except the court of the Venetian Palace at Rome, and one or two other less important examples, there is really nothing to compare with it in Italy.

The dimensions of this court are 243 ft. by 220, from one face of the colonnade to the other, which are perhaps greater than so delicate a design can well sustain; and it possesses nineteen arches on the one side and twenty-one on the other. Its great beauty, however, consists in the proportion of the two superimposed colonnades one to another, and of all the parts to the work they have to perform. The effect is due, even more than this, to the amount and exquisite beauty of the details with which the whole is covered, and its great crowning cornice is perhaps, for the situation it occupies, the most successful instance of design of this age which Italy possesses. In a smaller court such a cornice would be too deep and too bold, but here its proportions are as near perfection as can well be conceived, and all its details form a triumph of the art of design.

The external façade towards the street was added at the same time, and, by a singularity found nowhere else, the pointed arches of Filarete's design were repeated here, with only such modifications of detail as it is difficult to detect, but, strange to say, they are encased in a design which bespeaks most unmistakably the date of the seventeenth century, to which it belongs. The effect of this is not so displeasing as might be expected from this incongruity of parts, though it might have been better had they been brought a little more into harmony.

The third portion of the hospital has been completed in more modern times, and in a style so utterly tame and tasteless that it could only be found in Milan of all Italian cities.

Among the palaces of this city, the most original, if not the most beautiful, of the age to which it belongs, is the Casa Rotta,<sup>1</sup> opposite

<sup>1</sup> Said to be designed by Leone Leoni, otherwise known as the Cavaliere Aretino.

the Scala, and now used as the Custom-house. The principal façade is divided into three well-defined storeys, and ornamented with pilasters and a profusion of decoration, not certainly in the best taste, but never offensively vulgar and unconstructional. Its peculiarity is that it looks more like our Elizabethan, or as if erected in what might be called the Heidelberg style, it has so little affinity with the principal contemporary works in Italian cities. The courtyard is equally overdone with ornament, but the whole is singularly picturesque, and so free from errors of design, that we can forgive a little tendency towards the grotesque in a country where tameness and classicity are the besetting sins of the designers.

The Brera possesses some good points of design, but is indebted to its size more than to any other cause for its effect; and the Broletto, or Palazzo della Città, exhibits some pleasing bits of detail. It is an early specimen of the Renaissance style, but is too small, and too confined in situation, to display much architectural grandeur, so that all it attains to is a certain amount of picturesqueness, which is seldom wanting in buildings of its age. The Royal and Archbishop's Palaces, which occupy the whole of the south side of the piazza in which the Cathedral stands, and the new buildings which form its eastern side, are all large enough, and with a sufficiency of ornament, to make them important in an architectural point of view, but are of such commonplace design as to be unworthy of notice. In almost any other city of Italy they would have arrested attention, but Milan was either too German, or at all events too inartistic, to be able to avail herself of her opportunities.

#### VIII.—TURIN, NAPLES, &c.


Turin possesses little that need arrest the student of Architecture as a fine art. One of her earliest architects was Guarini,<sup>1</sup> a man who out-Heroded Borromini in the theatrical style of his art, and always sought to produce effects which might startle and sometimes please on the stage, but which are absolutely destructive when applied to so permanent an art as that of Architecture. He was succeeded by Ivrea and Vanvitelli, men with as little feeling for Art as can well be imagined, but whose good fortune it was to live in an age when the art was at its lowest ebb—so low that their productions were universally admired by their contemporaries, and they were consequently everywhere employed.

The Caserta Palace at Naples was erected by the latter, who had there such an opportunity as had not fallen to any architect in Italy of his day, it being the largest and most nobly decorated palace executed in that country since the Renaissance. The building (Woodcut No. 76)

<sup>1</sup> Born 1624; died 1683.



was commenced in 1752, and is an immense rectangle, 766 ft. long by 500 ft. wide, and 125 ft. high from the ground to the top of the balustrade. At each angle there is a square pavilion, and a high dome crowns the centre, but so placed as not to be seen externally, except at a distance. The design is perfectly uniform throughout, and consists of a rusticated basement, including two storeys of windows and a sunk storey. Above this is an interminable range of Ionic pilasters, with two storeys of large windows between each pair, and a smaller range in the frieze. The façades are only broken by very slight projections in the centre and at the ends, which, however, are hardly sufficient to destroy the painful monotony of the whole design. The best part of the arrangement is that the centre is divided into four equal courts by two



76.

Portion of the Façade of the Palace of the Caserta at Naples.

ranges of buildings containing the chapel, the great staircase, and halls leading to the state apartments, which are thus arranged not only with great convenience, but with very considerable architectural effect, internally; and a little more art would have made the courts themselves pleasing and effective. As a whole it is perhaps better than the Escorial, but otherwise it is as tame and uninteresting a design as any city in Europe can well show, and a painful illustration of how the art had fallen in Italy at the time of its erection.

## IX.—CONCLUSION.

The long cessation of intellectual activity which has been the sad fate of the country that first spread the light of Art and Literature over the continent of Europe, has prevented the Italians from reaching that second stage of the Renaissance which may be conveniently distinguished as the Revival. With the rarest possible exceptions, they have never added porticoes, borrowed literally from ancient temples, to their houses or public buildings. Whatever the faults of their style may have been, they never committed the absurdity of cutting a slice off one old building and planting it in front of a new one, wholly irrespective of either its use or appropriateness. Though they used the Orders everywhere, they were the Italian, not the Latin Orders; and, though even these seldom exactly expressed the construction, they were always interwoven with it, and pretended, at least, to represent it. They were, consequently, in Italy, far less offensive than the great unmeaning porticoes with which we in England seek to adorn our churches, our palaces, and our civil buildings. Neither have the Italians ever attempted such a Revival as the Madeleine or the Wallhalla, and, generally speaking, the revival of Greek Art, which at one time was so fashionable with us and the Germans, is utterly unknown to them. Whether freed Italy is to pass through this stage of Art, yet remains to be seen. Let us hope she will benefit by the experience of the other countries of Europe, and that she may also escape the Gothic mania, which is proving so fatal to real progress in Art. This, indeed, she may probably do, as she has no Mediæval style of her own of which she has any great reason to be proud; unless, indeed, it should happen, by one of those caprices which are only too common in Art when once it swerves from the true path, into mere copying, that the Italians should take it into their heads to borrow a French or English style, in return for the strange specimens of bad Mediæval Art we are now importing so freely from Italy.

If the Italians remain true to themselves, no nation in Europe has so fine a chance of attaining perfection in Architectural Art. Though the "Orders" may not be applicable to all purposes of civil or ecclesiastical buildings, they are at least the native products of the Italian soil; they are suited to the climate, and are hallowed by the associations of the land, but they are not the only elements of the art to which they belong. The misfortune of Italian Architecture was that its professors in the sixteenth century studied the remains of the temples—the domestic and civil buildings had nearly all disappeared—till they became pedants in their art, and enthusiastic for the doctrines of Vitruvius, whose want of knowledge and of true feeling for his art has rendered his influence so disastrous wherever it has been



felt. The consequence was, that they not only prescribed the use of columns for all places and purposes, but fixed their proportions and the exact form of their details by canons which no one has since dared to dispute. All real invention was thus put a stop to, and originality could only be attained in the design of window-frames or panellings, and minor ornaments, which were turned over to the tender mercies of men who, freed from the wholesome check of constructive necessity, sought to produce effects by the most uncontrolled wildness of decorative absurdity.

Italy has only to go back to the inspirations which characterise the end of the fifteenth and the dawn of the sixteenth century, to base upon them a style which will be as beautiful as it would be appropriate to her wants and her climate. If she will only attempt to revive the traditions of the great age which is hallowed by the memories of Leonardo da Vinci and Raphael, of Bramante, Sangallo, and even of Michael Angelo, she cannot go wrong. These men erred occasionally from inexperience, and because the system under which the art was conducted in their days was such as to render success impossible; but their aspirations were right, and there was an impress of nobleness on their works which has not since been surpassed.

Since their time the history of Italian Art may be summed up in a few words. During the fifteenth century it was original, appropriate, and grand; during the sixteenth it became correct and elegant, though too often also tinctured with pedantry; and in the seventeenth it broke out into caprice and affectation, till it became as bizarre as it was tasteless. During the eighteenth it sank down to a uniform level of timid mediocrity, as devoid of life as it is of art. In the present century it has been, if anything, French. But now that the country is again a nation, and has a future before it, it remains to be seen what her Art will become. If the Italians are capable of freedom, and of national greatness, their Architecture cannot fail to be a reflex of whatever is great or good in their character or institutions.

[THE MODERN ITALIAN STYLE.—The above argument is happily conceived and happily expressed, and is deserving of the student's particular and contemplative attention. As a matter of good sense alone, it must sooner or later become clear to the mind of anyone that the Cinque-centists, on their own Italian ground teeming with relics of the past, and in the exhilarating intellectual air of their great philosophical revolution, enjoyed a truly grand architectural opportunity. That they committed mistakes is matter of course; but that they achieved great successes no one who reads this book can fail to see, and to see with delight. Indeed, *à priori* philosophy may very fairly affirm that to sacrifice the claims of the Italian Renaissance in Art to be worthily regarded as a genuine and admirable Modern European Style is to undermine the whole reputation of that Modern European intellect whose

brilliancy in history no one but a frivolous pessimist could even pretend to dispute, and whose astonishing vigour seems to be still, in these apparently latter days, only in its robust youth. It was from Italy, as the centre and focus, that the light of modern civilisation thus spread in all directions—the civilisation of culture in place of superstition, of commerce in place of conquest, of freedom in place of oppression. That Italy has not kept pace with some other nations in the development of all that she initiated is not to be wondered at; but in her Arts, if no more, let it always be remembered, it is to Italy that expectant youth from every other land in the world still takes its way, to acquire the happiest inspiration under the brightest sky.—ED.]

[NATIONAL TASTE: ITALIAN, FRENCH, ENGLISH, AMERICAN.—It may be worth while to suggest, with reference to the closing lines of the author's argument above, this historical principle of national artistic evolution. The particular period in its history when any nation will happen to assume, if ever, a leading attitude, must depend upon the nature of those particular circumstances of the community which constitute the cause producing a national form of art as the effect. Now the condition of Europe, intellectually, socially, and commercially, in the fifteenth century was such that on Italian ground alone could the genius of Art arise and shine with a new light. Two consequences followed:—Italy took the lead in the movement of reform; and as the basis for this movement, Italy accepted the remains of her own antiquity. The degree of artistic merit which was to be manifested in the new Italian mode would depend upon the peculiar characteristics of the national mind, and also, of course, upon the amount of material encouragement capable of being supplied by the public or private wealth of the people. It was out of all these co-operating conditions that the Art of the period came, exactly as we see it. But when, in process of time, this function of Italy—as the founder of Modern Europe—was fulfilled, was it not fulfilled once for all? Apparently yes. In a word, Italy in due course lost the leading place, and has ever since followed France.

The rise of Modern French Art may be distinctly traced to the energetic receptivity with which Latin France so soon embraced the new Latin mode. The special aptitude of this keen and vivacious nation for the performance of imaginative work may be said to be undisputed throughout the world. As soon, therefore, as France became sufficiently instructed—by Italy—she took the lead in all the Arts; and she has kept it ever since. How much longer it is to be retained depends, first, upon the inevitable tendency of all acknowledged dominations towards exhaustion of power; and, secondly, upon the probability of some other competing nation being brought by the changing circumstances of the world into a new leadership on new ground. At present the chief danger to Art generally amongst the French seems to be the progress of



effeminacy; the facile fluency of it, and its exquisite touch, cannot be denied; but the time for reaction, if only by decay, appears perhaps to be coming, if it has not already come.

The rival merits of Germany do not appear to be yet prominently in question; perhaps it may be said that the very best German architecture of the present day has derived its inspiration directly from the French; but the question seems to be a perfectly fair one, is England to be the next to come to the front in Art? This is not to be promptly answered in the affirmative; but let no one be too hasty in delivering a negative opinion. If it be right to say that the dainty French-Latins are drifting into too effeminate art, are there any signs that the muscular and vigorous English-Tentons, so clearly in the ascendant in commerce and politics, are in the course of a little time, by the same road, to attain an ascendancy in Art by some new and more masculine development? There are many who think such evidences are distinctly appearing. Thoughtful Germans and Italians, and even Frenchmen themselves, are already pleased to express a most significant satisfaction with the art-works of the English; and in architecture especially, in spite of our many disadvantages, such approval is by no means grudgingly accorded.

"Westward the tide of Empire holds its way:" what shall we say of America? Practically the case stands thus: the leading men in the United States are Englishmen on the other side of a somewhat wide ferry; indeed, New York seems to be much more in touch with London than Dublin is, or even Edinburgh. This being so, let us observe how distinctly the English peculiarities are being emphasised and intensified in the typical Transatlantic character, so that already the doctrine is recognised by leading statesmen and men of affairs that the future of England is best to be foretold by studying the advance of America. May we say that the Gothic vigour of the Tenton, parting company with the enfeebled refinements of the Latin, and collecting all its energies at last on this Westward island of ours, has simply been forced to bridge the Atlantic for elbow-room, and, amidst the expanding potentialities of a truly new world, where the trammels of tradition are entirely shaken off, is of necessity exhibiting expanded powers? We do not require to look far into the future to see that the next century must work surprising changes in the culture and wealth of the Anglo-American race; and to say that the effect upon the Arts—which always follow culture and wealth—must to a certainty correspond, is but a truism. Moreover, no one who looks at the rapid progress which Art has been actually making in America since the war can fail to see that the foundations of an American artistic individuality are being already laid, and the names of its pioneers already recorded. For the present the art-students from the great Western Continent come for their inspiration to England and France; and no doubt they must for some considerable

time continue to do so ; but, just as England has ceased long ago to rely, as it once did, upon the Continent, so may America in due time cease to rely, as it does now, upon Europe. Let us remember, for instance, how the accident (in a certain sense) of the High Church movement brought out in the Gothic Revival a wealth of native English artistic power which not only was unexpected in other countries, but is still astonishing to true critics amongst ourselves. What is to be the accident in America, and when it is to happen, it is not necessary to speculate upon ; if history is to be as history has been, the hour will come, and the men. One thing, however, we may at any rate venture to predict :—the new mode of America will not be an effeminate manifestation, but a masculine one. Whether it will attain to the refinement of France and Italy is probably to be doubted ; but that it will emulate the muscular virility of England seems already sure.—Ed.]

#### X.—RECENT ARCHITECTURE IN ITALY.

[When the political union of the Italian States was achieved under King Victor Emmanuel, and the nation started on a new career, the influence of such a change could not but be felt in the national architecture. But, owing to the particular circumstances in which the country had so long been placed, the effect of such influence would be somewhat slowly developed. Italy was already the land of *Academical Art par excellence* ; the population traded upon it. The reign of artistic tradition in the public mind had not only been long established and firmly settled, but there was no immediate impulse at work to change its general policy. Even such a revolutionary measure as the overthrow of the absurd temporal power of the Mediæval Papacy, for example, did not carry with it in any material form such a result as the abandonment of a Mediæval system of building, for no such system had been in vogue. The mass of the educated population, no doubt, very soon began to incline more and more towards the social and commercial conditions of England and France, and indeed America ; the railway and the steamship, cheap postage and electric telegraphy, would answer for that ; but, in respect of the artistic classes of the people, those nations had more to learn from Italy than to teach her. However, it must certainly have come about in due time, and in a short time, that building enterprise would manifest itself in the Italian towns on the same lines as in London and Paris ; and then there might make its appearance a modification of traditional modes of design, to correspond with this novel activity. And such has been the case, and little else than this has happened.

Referring to the question of the effect produced throughout the world by the great industrial movement which is identified with International




Exhibitions, it is manifest that in Italy there would be less that required to be accomplished in that direction as regards Architectural Art than in any other country—except France alone—for Italy had long been an acknowledged sanctuary of the industrial arts in question. The master-pieces of her own Renaissance artizans were amongst her most valued possessions. The decayed palaces of her old families were often more full of the ornamental than of the useful. But it is enough to say that the rejuvenation of her national vitality has assisted undoubtedly in the awakening of her industrial enterprise, and that in course of time the Italian craftsmen must inevitably take an important part in advancing the importance of all the decorative arts.

Ecclesiastical building cannot be said to have made any particular sign in Italy, and with all respect we may suggest that the pre-existing ecclesiastical edifices were quite sufficient for the practical wants of the nation for a long time to come. The most characteristic enterprise of the kind has been the building in Rome of a demonstrative American Protestant Church, from the design of Street of London, a creditable work, of course, if judged by the standard of that architect's peculiar proclivities, but perhaps of more questionable merit as a matter of foreign self-assertion. The architects of the Eternal City, in a peculiar phase of feeling, genuine enough in its way, delivered an urgent protest against this rivalry of a foreign Imitation-Gothic architect, and this building of an Imitation-Gothic church, where Gothic men and manners were equally unwelcome and out of place. But the objection was necessarily overruled by law when perhaps it might have been sustained by good taste, and we may be content to take it as a sign of the times that for once American puritanism and English sacerdotalism should have sung the songs of Zion together by the waters of Babylon with so much mutual satisfaction.

The bulk of the new building in the Italian cities, sometimes carried out on a large scale, has been of the same commercial and occasionally municipal class as in other towns of Europe, and the style has been the established Modern European. There has been no need for any general reform, or indeed any local change. It cannot be said that an advance in taste has been achieved: it is enough now if Italy follows France with credit; she does not lead; even in the Arts her leadership is over long ago.—Ed.]

#### XI.—ILLUSTRATIONS OF RECENT ARCHITECTURE IN ITALY.

[A very few examples will be sufficient to illustrate the characteristics of recent Italian work upon Italian ground. It is no doubt less refined than the corresponding work of the French, less thoughtful than that of the Germans, and of course more academical than that of the English. It also exhibits that leaning towards Rococo which has been characteristic



Fine Art Galleries, Paris.



of the Latin race in ancient as well as modern times, and especially in the more sunny lands.

The design of the Fine Art Galleries at Rome (No. 76*a*) is one which is directed very successfully to the achievement of an effect of dignity, simplicity, and repose. The exaggerated archway of entrance may perhaps be put down to a little excusable ambition in the case of an Exhibition Building, but in other circumstances the principle of the


76*a*.

Building on the Corso, Rome.

triumphal arch thus applied is always liable to be charged with affectation as a set-off to its grandeur. The fault of false columniation is characteristic; to make buttresses of columns has always been one of the radical faults of the Renaissance. The sculptural accessories lend a charm to the architecture which it is impossible to understand why the English should so systematically ignore. One of the most urgent requirements in practical architecture in England is the reduction of the cost of such statuary; it is a mere affectation on the part of sculptors to maintain a scale of prices which is prohibitive; inexpensive art need not

be inferior art, and cheap figure-carving in Italy, and indeed in France, Belgium, and Germany, is certainly not so. On the whole it will be acknowledged that the composition of this façade is highly meritorious.

The building on the Corso at Rome (No. 76*b*) is a characteristic specimen of the more ordinary Italian work of good class. The spurious



76c.

Victor Emanuel Gallery, Milan.

pediments over the openings are of course more showy than legitimate ; and the same remark may be made with respect to several other features in the composition ; but in a " Queen Anne " age we are not obliged to throw stones of this kind ; and a good meretricious design is certainly not to be despised in Italy.

The Victor Emanuel Gallery of Milan (No. 76*c*), although only



what we may call an "Arcade" of shops, is an excellent example of modern work. Here again the effort to produce a showy effect is manifested without academical reserve; but the fault is still only characteristic of the age. Perhaps it may be observed, as an exercise in composition, that the position of the lower statuary in this example is particularly open to criticism, and that the introduction of Ionic capitals into the buttresses (for so they really are) seems to be almost a gratuitous inconsistency.—ED.]

## BOOK II.

## SPAIN.

---

Ferdinand and Isabella .. .. .	1474	Charles II. .. .. .	1685
Fall of Granada .. .. .	1492	Philip V. .. .. .	1706
Charles I. (V. of Germany) .. .. .	1516	Ferdinand VI. .. .. .	1746
Philip II. .. .. .	1556	Charles III. .. .. .	1759
Philip III. .. .. .	1598	Charles IV. .. .. .	1788
Philip IV. .. .. .	1621	Joseph Napoleon .. .. .	1808

---

## INTRODUCTION.

THE difficulties which are met at every turn, when attempting to acquire correct information with regard to the Mediæval antiquities of Spain, are increased tenfold when we come to examine the history of the Renaissance styles. The truth seems to be that up to a very recent period all architectural travellers in Spain were so fascinated by the elegance and picturesqueness of the Moorish remains of Granada and Seville, or Cordova, that they could not be persuaded to look beyond; and book after book, frequently most superbly illustrated, was published, not only in English and French, but even in Spanish, to illustrate these fascinating productions. By degrees the subject has been worn threadbare; and it has also been discovered that at Cairo, and throughout Anatolia, Persia, and India, there are examples in the same style far purer and far more worthy of study than the plaster glories of the Spanish Moors. The result of this has been that recently some attention has been paid—though only in a careless, sketchy way—to the Mediæval antiquities of the country; and with the materials now available a tolerably correct judgment may be formed, not only as to the extent, but as to the principal characteristics of the Gothic buildings in the Peninsula; it will however be many years before this mine is sufficiently worked out to induce explorers to turn their attention to the very unfashionable styles of the Renaissance. No traveller has yet visited Spain who had sufficient knowledge of Architecture to enable him to discriminate between what was good and what bad, or who had sufficiently enlarged views on the subject to enable him to appreciate the relative value of the different styles of Art now found in the country. We have books in abundance on the glories of the Alhambra and of



Moorish Art generally—we have latterly had some fine bursts of enthusiasm about the Cid, and Gothic Art in Spain—but for the Renaissance we are left to the prosy twaddle of Ponz or the dry text of Caen Bermudez, which, though eminently useful to those who have the buildings before their eyes, are worthless, from their deficiency in illustrations, for the purposes of stay-at-home explorers. Perhaps it may be that there are good reasons for this indifference. It may be that the Spaniards themselves are as inartistic as they are deficient in some more important qualities. The Moors, who occupied the south, were, we know, eminently artistic in all they did ; so were some of the northern nations, who penetrated across the Pyrenees in the early centuries of the Christian era, and occupied the Asturias and Old Castile ; but as the one race was expelled and the other absorbed, the Iberian element again came to the surface, and, as it predominated, Art seems to have died out under the depressing influences of exclusiveness and bigotry. Were the Iberians Semitic?—or did they belong to some even harder or less artistic race?

Whatever the cause, the result is nearly certain that, in so far as the Renaissance is concerned, it is only the first burst of it that is really worthy of much attention. The first symptoms of the new style displayed themselves during that period of exultation and of pride that followed on the fall of Granada, and the union of all Spain under the glorious tutelage of Ferdinand and Isabella. It continued to flourish till nearly the death of Charles V.—1492 to 1558—a period during which Spain, from her discovery of the New World, and the position of her monarchs as the greatest sovereigns of Europe, combined with the energy of the great men who then illustrated her councils, stood forward practically as the leading nation of Europe. The enthusiasm and exultation of the first half of the sixteenth century are well expressed in the buildings of that age, but they perished under the iron rule of Philip II. During the reign of this monarch nothing was thought of by him but the extension of his dominions, by whatever means this might be attained. The priesthood were bent on the acquisition of that power which the intolerance of the Spanish character and the dread of innovation enabled them to accumulate, and the laity were engrossed in the pursuit of those riches which the discovery of the New World had revealed to them. Art was not likely to flourish in a nation so occupied ; and the cold academical productions of Herrera are only too true a reflection of the small fraction of the national mind that could be spared for such purposes. What Palladio and Vignola did for Italian Art, Herrera<sup>1</sup> did for Spanish, but without the gentleness and elegance which characterised the works of these two architects. However grand or rich his works

<sup>1</sup> Died 1597.

may be, there is no human interest in them; and it is hardly to be wondered at that tourists look with indifference on their cold formality. The Spaniards themselves soon tired of it, and in the seventeenth century broke out into a wildness of style which out-Herods the absurdities of Borromini or the most meretricious examples of the Louis Quatorze style. The forms then used were such as are now relegated to the carver and gilder, and no single instance of anything like grandeur of conception can be quoted.

The Spaniards distinguish these three epochs by calling the first the *Plateresco*, or silversmith's style—a term which perfectly expresses the elegant exuberance of their first efforts, extending from the fall of Granada nearly to the abdication of Charles V. in 1555. The second, which they call the *Grieco-Romano*—heavy and pedantic, like its name—characterised the reign of Philip II. and his two successors, lasting consequently down to the middle of the seventeenth century. The third, which the Spaniards distinguish by the unpronounceable cognomen of *Churrigueresque*, from the name of the architect who was the chief author of the monstrosities of his age, flourished for nearly a century, or say from about 1650 to 1750. During the last hundred years they have done nothing worthy of being quoted; and it still remains to be seen whether the recent outbreak of the nation will lead to anything sufficiently lasting to encourage a revival of Art. Their recent resumption of a political position among the great nations of Europe has been so unexpected, that a year or two ago it would have been unphilosophical to assume that they might not achieve an artistic success as great as their political; but recent events have dispelled even that gleam of hope. What the future may bring forth no human being can foretell, but the previous history of the Iberian mind by no means encourages sanguine views on the subject of Art, and they certainly have as yet shown no tendency towards development in that direction.

[The "recent" events here alluded to are of course to be associated with the original date of writing.—Ed.]



## CHAPTER I.


## ECCLESIASTICAL ARCHITECTURE.

ALL the buildings of Ferdinand and Isabella are, so far as we know, in the late Gothic style. San Juan de los Reyes at Toledo is as Gothic as Henry VII.'s Chapel at Westminster ; so is the Capella in which they lie entombed at Granada, though the sarcophagi on which their effigies repose are of an advanced Cinque-cento style ; but these were made at Genoa, and Italy was then some fifty years in advance of Spain. Even in the time of Charles V. we find a Gothic feeling prevailing, in church-building at least, to an extent that is rather startling.

The Cathedral at Salamanca, commenced in 1513, is purely Gothic in style, though it betrays the Transition in our knowing the name of the architect who designed it, Gil de Houtanon, and that the work was continued by his son Rodrigo, after his death. We know, too, that their work there was so much admired that they were selected as the architects of the Cathedral of Segovia, one of the largest and finest in all Spain ; which, though commenced in 1525, and continued by Gil till his death, in 1577, is so Gothic in all the parts that he superintended, that it scarcely can be called a Renaissance work in any respect.

Almost the first work in which Renaissance feeling distinctly appears is the Cathedral at Granada, commenced in 1529, from designs by Diego de Siloe, and yet even this can hardly be called more Classical than the contemporary church of St. Eustache at Paris. Its plan is at first sight purely Gothic, but, on closer examination, it contains arrangements which are not only novelties but improvements upon anything done before ; and such, that, if they had been fairly worked out, would have produced a church better fitted for the dignified performance of Roman Catholic rites than anything which we have yet seen. The centre aisle, which is 40 feet wide, instead of terminating in a mere apse of the same width, expands into a dome 70 feet in diameter, beneath the centre of which, in a flood of light, stands the high altar. The supports of this dome are so numerous and so distributed that it might as easily have been constructed 170 feet in diameter and of any height. No modern dome is, in fact, so constructively arranged ; and as it was not proposed that there should be any thoroughfare under it, or that it should lead to anything beyond, the

number of points of support which are introduced, and their being somewhat crowded, is a beauty rather than a defect. It opens by an arch, said to be 190 feet <sup>1</sup> high, into the body of the church; and were it not that the centre aisle, as in all Spanish cathedrals, is blocked up by the choir, the vista from the western entrance would be unrivalled. The aisles on each side of the central one lead to two subordinate



77. Plan of the Cathedral at Granada. From *Bernández de Pedraza*. Scale 100 feet to 1 inch.  
a. Chapel of Ferdinand and Isabella. b. Sagrario.

altars, which close their vista most artistically and appropriately. The outer aisle forms an ambulatory round the whole building, and communicates with all the chapels which surround it. The cathedral

<sup>1</sup> Probably if the odd 90 were deducted it would be nearer the truth, but no correct details of the church have ever been published. Among the hundreds of artists who go into ecstasies and write books about the Alhambra, not one has ever condescended to look at this most interesting church.




is 400 feet long by 230 wide, and therefore of the first class, so far as size is concerned; and it has besides, the splendid chapel in which the Catholic Kings lie buried, and a Sagrario, or parish church, 100 feet square, on the right of the entrance.

Looking at its plan only, this is certainly one of the finest churches in Europe. It would be difficult to point out any other, in which the central aisle leads up to the dome, so well proportioned to its dimensions, and to the dignity of the high altar which stands under it, or one where the side aisles have a purpose and a meaning so perfectly appropriate to the situation, and where the centre aisle has also its function so perfectly marked out and so well understood. All this being so, it is puzzling to know how it has been so neglected. Is it that the neighbouring Alhambra eclipses its glories altogether?—or is it that its details are so bad or so baldly drawn as to mar the effect of the very beautiful plan and arrangements of the whole? This silence can hardly be accounted for, but no description of it appears in any modern book, and there is no drawing either of the exterior or interior, by which we can really judge of its effect. Such drawings as we do possess would lead us to suppose that the external form of the dome was not pleasing. The façade is unfinished, but any photographs that can be procured give a pleasing impression of the elegance and purity of its design. The *Puerta del Perdon* (marked A on the Plan), leading into the circular part of the choir, is certainly as rich a specimen of Renaissance Art as is to be found anywhere. Its taste is questionable, as the Roman Orders are used merely as ornaments, without reference to constructive propriety; but the whole is so rich, there is such an exuberance of ornament, and such a play of fancy, that in any other position it could not be passed over without remark. The interior of the church must have beauties which an architect would discover in spite of the whitewash which covers it, and in spite, too, of the gaudy colouring of its Moorish rival on the neighbouring hill, which has so eclipsed it hitherto in the eyes of tourists; but if they exist they have not been remarked by any of those who have written about Granada up to the present time.

The Cathedral of Jaen, like that of Granada, is said to have been built on the site of the great mosque of the city. It was commenced in 1525 by an architect called Valdelvira, and is interesting from its plan being arranged in a manner peculiar to Spanish cathedrals, but not found in any earlier example, though frequently afterwards. It is a parallelogram 300 ft. long by 175 in width, arranged in three aisles, with a series of chapels, beyond the outer one. Such an arrangement has neither the poetry nor grace of that of Granada, but it may be better suited to the incipient Classical style which was then being introduced. Internally, its architecture is of the same pattern as that of Granada. The piers (*Woodcut No. 78*) consist of four half-columns of

the Corinthian Order, attached to the four sides of a square pier, and over this is a block of the entablature, with its frieze, cornice, &c., spreading over like a great mushroom, and inartistically cutting off the pier-arches from their supports. If this entablature had been omitted, and the arches of the great vaults sprung direct from the capitals of the pillars, their effect, from their size and richness, would have been extremely grand. In the centre there is a great dome, which relieves their monotony, so that altogether it required very little to make the whole pleasing and satisfactory; but white, or rather yellow, wash seems to have obliterated what beauties it possessed, and to have increased the repugnance of tourists to study its peculiarities.

As the Church of Malaga is one of those which artists occasionally sketch, we are able to form some idea of the effect of the exterior of these half-Gothic, half-Classic buildings of this age. That at Segovia is very similar, though earlier in style. Their principal merit is that they are devoid of affectation; there are no pilasters or useless columns; but their outline wants variety, and the windows are generally so small that they have a gloomy flatness which is seldom relieved by buttresses or pinnacles to the extent it must have been in an earlier age. Their façades were always intended to be relieved by steeples, generally in pairs; but, as in these two instances, seldom finished; seldom, indeed, is even one quite completed, as it is, however, at Malaga (Woodcut No. 79). The transeptal en-



78. Capital of Cathedral at Jaen.

trances are frequently more fortunate than those of the principal façade, partly because the building was commenced generally from the choir-end, and partly because, being less ambitious, they were more manageable. In this church, that shown in the Woodcut, and called the Puerta de las Cadenas, though unfinished, is a fair specimen of the style; and the whole flank of the building is as agreeably composed as any of its age. If it misses some of the beauties of Gothic, it has at least none of the falsities of the pseudo-Classic; and makes us regret that architects, instead of following out what is here sketched, took to copying what was irrelevant and useless.

The cathedral of Valladolid is an extension of that of Jaen in plan, and thoroughly Spanish in all its arrangements; but having been commenced in the reign of Philip II., from designs by Giovanni d'Herrera, it is strictly Classical in all its details. Its dimensions are



very considerable, being 400 ft. long by 205 in width;<sup>1</sup> and it was to have had a tower 240 ft. high at each of its four angles. The interior is severe and simple; and, as far as can be judged from the materials available, is one of the most effective, as it is one of the largest, churches of its age; simple in arrangement, grand in proportion, and ornamented with taste, in spite of the meddling of Churriguerra at a later age.

The second cathedral of Zaragoza, called *Del Pilar*, from possessing



79. Puerta de las Cadenas, Cathedral of Malaga. From *Parcrista, "Recuerdos,"* &c.


the identical pillar on which the Virgin descended from heaven, is even larger than that last described, being 435 ft. long by 220 in width, so that it covers nearly 100,000 ft. It was, however, commenced at a bad age (1677), by Francisco Herrera, continued at various intervals by different architects, and even now can hardly be said to be complete.

<sup>1</sup> Its superficial dimensions are consequently very nearly identical with those of our St. Paul's.

<sup>2</sup> *Parcrista's "Recuerdos y Bellezas de España,"* now in course of publication at

Madrid, is one of the best and most complete works of its class, but possesses neither plans nor architectural details of any sort.

Although possessing elements of grandeur about it, the fatal effects of bad taste are everywhere so apparent that its design is very unworthy of its dimensions and of the position it holds as the largest and most celebrated modern church in Spain. Externally, the principal defect is that it has no dome or central point of sufficient size to relieve the squareness and flatness of the design. The central dome being really the one great invention of the Renaissance architects, and the one point




80. Plan of the Cathedral at Valladolid. From Ponz, 'Viage.' Scale 100 feet to 1 inch.

which fairly challenges comparison with anything in Mediaeval Art. It is the feature which gives such dignity externally to St. Peter's, St. Paul's, and other churches of the same class; it is consequently sadly missed here, and its place would not have been supplied by the four towers which were intended to have adorned its angles. One only of these has been carried as high as the third storey; the rest are only of the height of the roof, and do not suffice to relieve the flatness which is inherent in the few openings and unbroken line of walls so common in



Spanish buildings. In this respect the Gothic Seo—as the other Cathedral of Zaragoza is called—is more fortunate. It has one complete tower of *Cinque-cento* design (Woodcut No. 83), and which may be considered as a typical specimen of the campaniles of Spain of this age. Though not perfect, either in outline or in detail, it avoids many of the defects which architects too frequently fall into in designing buildings with great vertical dimensions in a style where horizontal features essentially prevail. The rusticated basement is solid and well proportioned; the next storey also is without openings and without an Order, properly so called; and the two others gradually increase in lightness as they ascend. It is very doubtful whether the termination we now see is that originally designed, but the effect is not ungraceful, and avoids the common defect of placing a dome on so tall a building, where it always appears low and squat, or of adding a spire whose lines can hardly be made to accord with the forms of Classical Art. This tower was commenced in the year 1685, from the designs of a Roman architect, J. B. Contini, who was also the architect of the Hospital of Montserrat. Its height is about 300 ft. English.



81. Plan of the Cathedral del Pilar at Zaragoza. From Ponz.  
Scale 100 feet to 1 inch.

In the church of San Andrea at Madrid is a chapel to San Isidro, a saint famous here, though scarcely known elsewhere. It was erected by Philip IV. and Charles II. at the very end of the seventeenth century, and is a very fair specimen of the style of ornamentation in the churches of this epoch. Rich and gorgeous they certainly are, and generally also freer from faults of exaggeration than their Italian congeners, but they are not satisfactory as a whole, and though grand, even it may be said palatial, they seldom produce the effect of solemnity so desirable in a

church, though their arrangements are never such as to admit of their being taken for anything else.

The principal defect is that, in the first place, they are over-ornamented, every part being covered with mouldings or panellings, and these generally accentuated with colour. But a worse defect than this is that the ornaments generally are in very bad taste. The fatal facility afforded by plaster allowing the artist to run wild in his decorations, and having no restraint of construction, when seized with a hankering after novelty, it requires a degree of restraint and self-control which few architects can exercise, not to indulge in too exuberant decoration.



t2.

View of the Cathedral del Pilar at Zaragoza. From *Parcerua*.

Perhaps the most redeeming feature of Spanish churches are the steeples with which they are almost invariably adorned. In Italy there is scarcely an instance in the Renaissance times where the campanile is successfully wedded to the body of the building. In most instances they are entirely detached, or, when in juxtaposition, their plainness and great height are rather destructive than otherwise to the effect of the building. In France there is scarcely a single example of a successful Renaissance steeple. There are western towers at St. Sulpice and St. Vincent de Paul, but even these can hardly be called remarkable, and they are exceptional, and not such features as will bear examination by themselves. The Spaniards, on the other hand, never seem to have thought a design complete without two or four steeples being attached to it, and these very often were of great beauty of design. The example at Malaga, quoted above (*Woodcut No. 79*), and that of the Seo at



Zaragoza (Woodcut No. 83), are fair average specimens of the class. They are found attached to every church and every convent in Spain, and not only give a peculiar local character to the landscape, but produce, in fact, by far the most pleasing effects of Architectural Art in that country.

Perhaps the most pleasing group of steeples to be found in Spain is that which adorns the Cathedral of Santiago. The façade of the church, it is true, was built as late as 1738, and will not therefore bear examination; but its general outline is so picturesque, it fits so pleasingly with the old cloister, which is two centuries earlier, and these, with the steeples, make up a group of buildings so picturesque in outline and so gorgeous in details, that he must indeed be severe in taste who can resist the fascination of such an assemblage of buildings. There are other specimens at Xeres, at Carmona, and at other places, where their tall spires give a character to the outline of the towns as beautiful as it is truly local and Spanish.

It is of course true that during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the Spanish architects did build steeples which were as frightful as can well be conceived; but these were certainly the exception, and then it was only in the depth of their architectural Dark Ages. As a general rule, the steeple is the feature of their churches which they managed with the most success, and which gives the greatest amount of character, not only to their churches but to their towns, from whatever point of view we look at them.



83. Tower of the Seo, Zaragoza. From *Parcerria*.

## CHAPTER II.

## THE ESCURIAL.

WHAT Versailles is to France and to the history of French Renaissance Architecture, the Escorial is to Spain and to its architectural history. They are both of them the greatest and most deliberate efforts of the national will in this direction, and the best exponents of the taste of the day in which they were erected. The Spanish example, however, is, as nearly as may be, a century older than its rival, having been commenced in 1563, it is said in consequence of a vow made by Philip II. at the battle of St. Quentin, and, like Versailles, it had two architects, the original designs having been furnished by Gianbattista, of Toledo, but the actual execution being the work of the celebrated Herrera, who succeeded on the death of the original architect, which took place in 1567.

It is not possible to establish any very exact parallel between the two buildings which were erected for such dissimilar purposes. Versailles was designed as the residence of a gay and brilliant court, and a theatrical chapel in the back yard was added only as the pendent to the more important Theatre, which was an indispensable adjunct to such a palace. The Escorial was the splendid abode of a great but gloomy despotism, where the church was the principal and grandest feature of the design, and the abodes of priests occupied the places which at Versailles were appropriated to courtiers.


Architecturally, too, it must be observed that the design of Versailles is wholly external; all its bravery is on its face, and looks outwards; while whatever there is of grandeur or elegance in the Spanish example must be looked for in the courtyards, or in the church which forms the centre of the whole composition. Externally the building is little better than a great granite barrack, and, though the façade does make some pretension to architectural design, it is of the most commonplace character, excusable only on the plea that it is a screen—a shell, in fact—to contain a noble kernel inside.

Every modern author, in describing this building, begins by asserting that the *motivo* of the design was to represent the gridiron on which St. Lawrence suffered martyrdom. Though the conceit is clever, it hardly seems tenable, inasmuch as any one who looks at the pictures of the martyrdom of the saint which are contemporary with the building of the



palace, will see that their conception of the instrument of torture used for the occasion was an iron bedstead, very appropriate for the purpose, but as unlike our notion of a gridiron as it is unlike the plan of the Escorial. The whole story seems a mistaken invention of a later date.

Be this as it may, the general conception of the building is singularly grand and appropriate. The great façade, with its three well-proportioned entrances, and its two flanking towers, is just sufficiently broken for effect, and is well-proportioned both as to height and length ; for though



84. Plan of the Escorial. From Ximenes, '*Monasterio del Escorial*,' fol. 1764.<sup>1</sup>

only one half the length of the garden façade at Versailles, it is not only higher, but very much more broken in outline.

Nothing can be grander than the arrangement of the central entrance, leading to a well-proportioned atrium in front of the great basilica, and having on the right hand the Colegio, on the left the monastery, beyond which is the palace, which culminates in the state apartments, further on and immediately behind the high altar. Nor can anything be much

<sup>1</sup> No plan of the building has been yet published which can be depended on either for correctness of detail or dimensions, and as a general rule the views are not much more trustworthy.

better than the four smaller courts of the college, leading up the grandest court of the whole building, and on the other side the gradual increase of magnificence to the great court of the palace, and thence to the state apartments. But the crowning beauty of the whole arrangement is, that through all and above all rises the church with its dome and two western towers, giving dignity and point to the whole, and supplying that feature the want of which is so painfully felt at Versailles and the Tuileries. In the entire design of the Escorial it cannot be said that there is one single



82.

Bird's-eye View of the Escorial. From a Drawing by D. Roberts, R.A.

feature which is in the wrong place, or which could be omitted without loss to the general effect, or one which is not perfectly proportioned not only to its place, but also to the relative influence it was intended it should have on the whole design. Yet with all this it must be confessed that the Escorial is a failure in an architectural sense; a great conception has, in fact, been utterly destroyed by the way in which it has been carried out.

The façade, which extends to 680 ft. in length, is ruined by the number of small windows which crowd it everywhere. Being really five storeys in height throughout, and seven, with an attic, in the



centre, the first five are comprehended in the height of the Doric Order of the central portico, though there are only three between the pillars, but one is added in the basement on either side of the central block, and another takes in the height of the entablature of the Order; the remaining two are comprised in an attic. All this is bad enough, but it is made worse by the small size of these windows and the want of appropriate dressings, which gives an air of meanness to the whole which the size of the façade rather adds to than diminishes. If all these small windows were necessary for the internal arrangements, as no doubt they were, the introduction of the Order at all was an unpardonable mistake, and two bold masses, like towers,



26. Section through the Church and Atrium of the Escorial. From Ximenes.

flanking the entrance, would have given it all the importance required, without incongruity. The angle towers, though well placed and well proportioned, require some further ornament, especially in the upper storeys, to give them dignity; they are designed merely like private dwelling-houses, three windows wide and nine storeys high. The flanks of the building are nothing more than plain granite walls, pierced with five storeys of unornamented square windows, with as little design and as little ornament as one generally finds in a Manchester cotton-mill. Where this extends over 520 ft. the effect is most unpleasing, especially as by a little grouping of the windows, and a few slight projections, it might easily have been avoided.

The atrium in front of the church, which, from the plan, we would expect to be the richest and most effective feature in the design, is

ruined from the same cause. On the right and left hand there is nothing but a plain factory-like building, five storeys in height, with the further singular disadvantage that, as the ground slopes upwards towards the entrance of the church, the string courses and cornice follow the incline; but the window-heads are horizontal, and each pair rises a little over the next, so as to follow the rake of the string. In no modern building is there so clumsy and so disagreeable a makeshift as this. The idea of the architect evidently was, that by the plainness of the flanks he could enhance the richness of the porch of the church—a clumsy theatrical trick, which was sure to fail. It is as if a lady were to put a blanket over her shoulders instead of a shawl in order to enhance the richness of her dress. If the sides of this court had been arcaded, like the great cloister, and had there been an appropriate entrance on either hand to the College and to the Palace, it would have been a restoration of the old and beautiful feature of an atrium which modern churches lack most sadly. As it is, the architect has actually been at the pains to provide an underground communication between the two sides of the building, in order not to break the uniform ugliness of the elevation.

The seven small courts, each about 60 ft. square, are not remarkable as architectural designs. They have each three tiers of arcades, one over the other, very plain and very unobjectionable. The Palace Court has on three sides an arcade, with a Doric Order in very good proportion, above which is a gallery with square-headed windows in panels. The most magnificent feature in the whole, however, is the Court of the College, about 140 ft. square, with an arcaded cloister, in two storeys, running round its four sides. There is a garden in the centre, with a fountain; and the whole is so well proportioned, and of such dimensions, that there is scarcely any cortile in an Italian palace to compare with this. Its one defect, and it applies to all the courts here, is that they are approached only through small doorways; and these not in the centre of the sides, but either in the angles of the courts or unsymmetrically on some part of the sides: consequently the courts do not produce any grand united effect, which they might easily have been made to do. Each is independent of the other, and no vista or general conception of the whole can be anywhere obtained.

The great feature of the group, however, is the Church; and whether we consider it with reference to its dimensions or to the grandeur of its design, it deserves to rank as one of the great Renaissance churches of Europe.

Its dimensions, as far as they can be made out from such plans as are available, are 340 ft. east and west, by 200 north and south, and it covers about 70,000 square feet. The dome is 60 ft. in diameter internally, or less than that of the Pantheon at Paris, but is single,



and of much simpler construction. Externally, the façade is not very remarkable, but there is nothing to offend good taste. It expresses perfectly the internal arrangements, and with its two flanking towers, is quite as imposing as the dimensions of the atrium require or would admit of.

Internally, there is in front a gallery extending across the church, similar to that of St. Peter's at Rome, and which may have suggested such an arrangement to Maderno. Passing this, you come to a feature wholly Spanish, and which probably no other church possesses, though one that, it is much to be regretted, was not often repeated. In order to understand this, it must be recollected that it is an essential feature in Spanish ecclesiological arrangements that the choir should occupy the centre of the nave, facing the altar, and in most cases blocking it up and destroying the vista and general proportions of the building. In the Church of the Escorial, and there only, has this arrangement been preserved without detriment to the architecture, inasmuch as you enter *under* the "Coro," through a low apartment divided by piers into three aisles, and which is practically 100 ft. long by the whole width of the church. Being imperfectly lighted, almost gloomy in fact, the dimensions and splendour of the church itself are immensely enhanced by this cavernous entrance. Beyond this the church is square in plan, and divided, by the four great piers of the dome and the arches they sustain, into a Greek cross in construction. The proportions of the church are good, and the details of the Doric Order, with which it is ornamented, are simple and unobtrusive, but on a scale designed for external architecture, and with details so large and bold as to be wholly unsuited for internal purposes, and which contrast most unpleasingly with the richness of the high altar, and the frescoes and decorations of the roof they support. This is indeed the great defect of the whole building, as carried out. The roof of the "Coro" was richly painted by Luca Giordano. The Ritratto of the high altar is rich and elaborate in decoration, as is the Capilla Mayor in almost all Spanish cathedrals. The pavement is of the richest marbles, and all this contrasts unpleasingly with the plain simple architecture of the supports of the dome. Either these ought to have been taken as the keynote of the composition, or they ought to have been decorated in harmony with the rest.

So much has been written, and from such different points of view, with regard to this "eighth wonder of the world," that it is difficult to form an impartial judgment regarding it. In dimensions it is about half the size of Versailles, less than the Caserta at Naples, and not so large as some of the Austrian convents; but it is quite large enough for any palatial effect, and is, on the whole, as purpose-like and as well-proportioned a design as is to be found in any palace in modern times. Its defects are those inherent in the style, consisting in the employment

of an "Order" where it was not wanted either for constructive or utilitarian purposes, and where it suggested neither ; but what is worse than this is that it displays everywhere that absence of thought which must prevail where one man draws everything on a board before a stone is laid, and, in this instance, intensified by its being built in granite, which prevented a more lavish employment of ornament, or greater freedom in designing the details, which make the monotony of parts more painfully apparent in this than in almost any other design of modern times.

The number of windows with which it is pierced externally would not have been a defect if they had been grouped, or had the wall been surmounted by a cornice, or any of the ordinary devices used to give it character ; but its prosaic, factory-like forms are all the more offensive because of the magnificence of the church, and other internal features which are seen from the outside. Internally, though the conception is everywhere good, it is so marred by defects in execution, that, notwithstanding the beauty of some parts, the whole must be considered as a failure ; but it is one of the grandest, as it is certainly the gloomiest, palaces of modern times.



## CHAPTER III.

## SECULAR ARCHITECTURE.


It is a relief to turn back from the granite coldness of the monkish Escorial to the secular or semi-secular buildings of the early part of the sixteenth century, and to revel awhile in the lawless exuberance with which the Spaniards expressed their joy at the expulsion of the Moors and the discovery of the New World.

One of the earliest, as well as one of the most important, undertakings of the first half of the sixteenth century was the building, or rather rebuilding, of the University of Alcalá, by the celebrated Cardinal Cisneros or Ximenes. He so enlarged the basis of the school which formerly existed there, that shortly afterwards it became the second University of Spain, and almost a rival to Salamanca. The building was commenced apparently about the year 1510, under the superintendence of Pedro Gumiel, and continued to about the year 1550, by Rodrigo Gil Hontanon, and other architects of the period.

The principal façade of the University is a fair specimen, though not the best, of the style of the day. Its ornament is rich and exuberant, and, if not in the best taste, like many other Spanish façades, it is solid towards the base, and has an open arcaded storey at the top, which is certainly one of the most pleasing architectural features that can be applied to Palatial Architecture, giving lightness combined with shadow exactly where they are wanted for effect, and where they can be supplied without any apparent interference with solidity. Except, indeed, in buildings of the very monumental class, an arcade under the roof is a more legitimate way of giving shadow than a deeply-projecting cornice, and so thought the early Spanish architects, who consequently employed this feature everywhere, and generally with the most pleasing effect.

Internally, the arrangements of the building do not seem designed for architectural effect so much as for convenience, though there are three cloistered courts, one of which is of very considerable magnificence, and the two smaller ones are also well worthy of attention. As architectural specimens, they do not equal the Court of the Archbishopal Palace, which belongs to the same age, and is extremely beautiful in its details, as may be seen from the annexed elevation of part of the edifice. The details of the bracket capitals of the upper storey are as pleasing

specimens as are to be found anywhere of a form which was felt to be indispensable for the successful carrying out of the widely-spaced system of supports which was then being introduced, and would be felt to be so now had we not sunk so completely into the groove of believing that what is Classical and established must be better than what is new or original. Still, a bracket capital is a desideratum in Architecture, and




87. Court of the Archiepiscopal Palace at Alcalá de los Hernáez. From Ventler and Cattols.<sup>1</sup>

is one the Spanish architects were in a fair way of supplying when the Classical school of Herrera put a stop to progress in this or any other direction. The Italians tried it at a very much earlier age. At Torcello and elsewhere we find them as early as the twelfth century, but never after the Revival in the fifteenth. It does not seem to have

<sup>1</sup> 'Architecture civile et domestique,' fol. Paris, 1858.



occurred to the French architects that such a thing was wanted, in stone Architecture at least, nor have any of the northern nations attempted it ; but the extreme elegance and convenience of this form is shown by the universal practice of Eastern architects, and the beauty with which it may be ornamented, and rendered ornamental, proves that its study will amply reward any one who will turn his attention to it. As a basis, he will hardly find better objects of study than the Spanish examples of the early part of the sixteenth century.



68. Paraninfo, Alcalá. From VillaAMIL, '*Espagne Artistique et Monumentale*.'

There is one State Apartment in the University, called the Paraninfo, which deserves attention not only for its intrinsic beauty, but from its being so essentially Spanish in design. The roof is of richly carved woodwork in panels, in a style borrowed from the Moors, and here called "*Artesonado*," of which there is another—perhaps more beautiful—specimen in the chapel, and under which is the "*Urna*" or cenotaph of the great Cardinal. There are many—there were numberless—examples of the same sort of work in various parts of Spain, all beautiful, and all resembling this one more or less, though no two are exactly alike,

Under this roof is an elegant range of arches, in the beautiful Plateresque style of that day, and the massive draperies below are perhaps as happy a mode of ornamenting the lower parts of the walls of such a room as can well be conceived.

In the monastery of Lupiana there is a cloistered court (Woodcut



89. View in the Cloister at Lupiana. From Villa Amil.

No. 89) similar in design to that at Alcala, but even grander, being four storeys in height, each gallery being lighter than the one below it, and so arranged as to give the appearance of sufficient strength, combined with a lightness and elegance peculiarly appropriate to Domestic Architecture, especially when employed internally, as it is here. On the exterior of a building such galleries would be too light for effect, but round a small court it is not so; and in this respect the Spanish architects have been far more happy than their Italian brethren. The latter were always thinking of and reproducing the arcades of the Amphitheatre; the Spaniards were following a Moorish or Mediæval design, till the Italian fashions

put a stop to their originality, and in so doing destroyed also their elegance.

It must be admitted, however, that some check was wanted to the exuberance of fancy in which the Spaniards seemed inclined to indulge at this age. It is almost impossible not to be charmed with the richness of the Patio in the so-called Palace of the Infanta, at Zaragoza, but, at the same time, not to feel that, though suited for ivory-carving or



cabinet work, Architecture so applied is unworthy of the name, even in its Domestic form, though there is far less elevation and purity demanded than in temples or buildings devoted to higher purposes.




90.

Court in the Palace of the Infanta at Zaragoza. From Villa Amil.

There are not, it must be confessed, many examples of such wildness as this, but many of the Lupiana style. There is, for instance, a staircase in the Hospital of Santa Cruz, in Toledo, which almost surpasses it.

But it must also be admitted that the Spanish mind was almost as frequently tempted to luxuriate in a half-Gothic, half-Classical style, as in the Palace of the Dukes of Infantado, at Guadalajara, at Burgos, Valladolid, and fifty other places that might be quoted, where we are more astonished by the richness of the decoration than delighted at its elegance; but, even in its worst phase, this exuberant style is far preferable to the cold, tame mediocrity of the succeeding age, and there are always, at least, some parts which may be unreservedly admired. In fact, wherever an edifice was erected or repaired during the first half of the sixteenth century, we are almost certain to fall on details of the best sort; and for any but the very highest purposes of Art, it would be difficult to find a style more appropriate than this is.

The buildings described in the last few paragraphs may all be considered as provincial examples, where the Spanish architects followed



31. Plan of the Palace of Charles V. in the Alhambra.  
Scale 100 feet to 1 inch.

out their own peculiar ideas of what Renaissance Architecture should be, uninfluenced by either Italian designs, or the knowledge of what had been done elsewhere. This was hardly the case with the buildings erected for the Court, of which a notable example is found in the Palace adjoining that of the Moorish Kings, in the Alhambra, and which Charles V. commenced for his own residence about the year 1527, from designs by the Spanish architect Machuca, though the principal part of what we now see appears


to have been erected by Berruguete. It unfortunately suffers, as any quasi-Classical building must do, from its immediate proximity to the Alhambra, and is also much abused, because it is asserted that some portion of the Moorish Palace was pulled down to make room for it. This, however, is more than doubtful; for it is by no means certain that the Alhambra was ever finished, or intended to be so, on a uniform plan; and the mode in which one angle of the new Palace was cut off, in order not to interfere with the old buildings, is in itself sufficient to refute the calumny.

As it now stands, the building is very nearly an exact square, 205 ft. each way, with a circular court in the centre a little less than 100 ft. in diameter. The basement is as nearly as may be half the height (28 ft.), very boldly rusticated, and contains a mezzanine with circular windows. A similar arrangement of windows prevails in the upper storey externally,



but was meant only to light and ventilate the state apartments. The Order of the basement is Doric—of the upper storey, Ionic—neither used with much purity, but combined with so much ornament, and that of so elegant a class, that the effect of the whole is extremely pleasing. Except in the centre of each face, the Orders are almost entirely subordinated to the ornamentation of the constructive details of the building, such as the window-dressings, panelling, and sculptured decoration; and where this is the case their introduction is seldom offensive. In the interior, the circular gallery is supported by a tall Doric Order on the ground floor, on which stands an Ionic Order of little more than half its height, a proportion which prevents any idea of weakness in the supports.

The Palace never was finished, so that we cannot judge of the mode in which it was proposed to ornament the principal rooms, nor do we know what the form of the roof would have been externally; but, as it



92. Part Elevation, part Section, of the Palace of Charles V. at Granada. Scale 50 feet to 1 inch.

stands, it may certainly be regarded as an elegant and pleasing specimen of Renaissance Architecture—not so grand or bold as the contemporary specimens at Rome or Florence, nor so picturesque as those of France—but dignified, elegant, and palatial, and free from any offence against good taste to an extent not often found in buildings of this class and age. Although much more Classical than those just described, it is still sufficiently original to be purely Spanish. There is no building, either in Italy or France, of that age, which can be said to be in exactly the same style, though it is evident, from what we find here, that Spain with all the countries of Europe were then tending towards that dull uniformity of design which is the painful characteristic of the succeeding century.

The Alcazar of Toledo is nearly of the same age as the Palace of Granada. The rebuilding of it, at least in its present form, seems to have been commenced by order of Charles V. in the year 1548, though not finished till it had felt the icy touch of Herrera under the reign of Philip II. The courtyard in the centre, which consists of two tiers of arches resting on pillars, is pleasing, but without the poetry of those at Lupiana or Alcala, being sadly deficient in richness or variety. The



93.

View of the external Façade of the Alcázar at Toledo.

most pleasing feature is, the design of the western (?) façade externally, exhibiting the truly Spanish features of solidity below with increasing richness and openness above, which, as before remarked, is so effective, and so little understood out of the Peninsula. It is now in ruins, having suffered from fire on several occasions, and is one of those buildings which artists do not draw, though it seems well worthy of more attention than has hitherto been bestowed upon it.

Judging from what we know of the history of Spain from the death of Philip II. down to the present day, we should hardly expect that his weak successors would be capable of any great or successful effort of architectural magnificence. It happened, however, that the Royal Palace at Madrid was burnt to the ground on Christmas Eve in 1734, when Philip V. determined to rebuild it on a new site, on a scale of magnificence corresponding to a Spaniard's idea of his own importance; and Ivrea, an Italian architect, was employed to realise this conception. From what we know of his designs in Italy, it is perhaps a matter of very little regret that, like most things Spanish, it never was realised; but a much smaller one was erected by another Italian, Sachetti, on the old site, and, considering that it was commenced in 1737, it is a very fair specimen of the age and style. It is a solid square building, measuring 404, or, according to some authorities, 440 ft. each way, with a courtyard in the centre 240 ft. square; and



as its height, at least on the side facing the river, is nearly 100 ft. the mass is very imposing. It loses much of this effect when it comes to be examined, in consequence of its being cut up by a multitude of small windows. The rusticated basement has three storeys of windows ; three more are included in the Order which stands upon it, and a seventh is visible over the cornice. Either it must be that the rooms on the principal floor have two storeys externally and one internally, or there cannot be a single apartment of a height suited to a palace in the whole building. The details, too, are generally coarse, and frequently designed with that absence of constructive propriety which



54.

View of the Palace at Madrid. From a sketch by D. Roberts, R.A.

characterises the Italian Architecture of the day, so that the present palace has little beyond its mass and the general grandeur of its outline to recommend it for admiration. In so far as we can judge from such drawings as exist, the old buildings which it superseded had a good deal in them that was certainly more picturesque, and probably even more artistic. The principal façade was in three storeys, and had only three ranges of windows—one in a plain basement, the two upper each with their own Order, and of palatial dimensions and height.<sup>1</sup> It looked like a palace in reality, not like an asylum or hospital trying to look like a building of a higher class.

<sup>1</sup> A very good set of views of this Palace were published by Vander Aa, in his *Beschryving van Spanjen*, Leyden, 1707.

The Palace at Aranjuez is next in importance among those of Spain after the Escorial and that of the metropolis. Although not very remarkable either for its dimensions or the beauty of its details, it is generally in very tolerable taste, and free from many defects found in contemporary examples of the same class of buildings. The central portion is sufficiently dignified without being overpowering, and the wings are well proportioned to the central mass. The junction between these two parts is pleasingly accentuated by the domes in the angles, and the whole sky-line sufficiently broken to prevent monotony. Taking it altogether, there are few buildings in Spain, of the same age (it was rebuilt in 1739 by Philip V.), which are so little objectionable as this.

San Idelfonso is a Spanish Versailles, but on a much smaller scale, with more tawdry details, and, though with more pretension than Aranjuez, is very contemptible in general design. The Belvidere and Buen Retiro deserve no mention in a work pretending to describe only objects of Architectural Art.

As Spain has no municipal institutions worth mentioning, she has no municipal buildings of sufficient importance to be alluded to here. At some of her principal ports there are Lonjas or Exchanges which are buildings of some pretension. That at Seville was built by Herrera, and is probably the best example we have of his style, being regular and chaste, without the extreme coldness and formality of his usual manner. The Lonja at Barcelona is also much admired, but it will easily be understood that its real merits are not great when it is known that it was rebuilt in 1772 from the designs of a local architect, Juan Soler. It is according to the usual recipe, a basement with the usual complement of windows, one storey high, on which stands a range of pilasters including two, with pediments, &c., at intervals.

At Madrid, where one would naturally expect something better, there does not seem to be any building worthy of notice as a specimen of Architecture. Ponz and others quote the Carcel del Corté, or prison for the nobles; but it certainly would be considered a very contemptible specimen of the art, either for dimensions or style, in any provincial town in England; and the Council house and other buildings which ought to be of importance are as commonplace as we can imagine anything to be. The one exception to this seems to be the Museo—a gallery of pictures, which, if not quite successful in design, has so many good points about it as to be well worthy of study, and, with a very little more taste in the arrangement of the details, might have been a really fine building. It was commenced in the reign of Charles III., by an architect of the name of Juan de Villanueva, but was not completed till some time afterwards. The principal façade has the merit of having its entrance well marked by a portico of six Doric columns, which are not surmounted by a pediment, and



on either side is a basement of good proportion and elegant design, supporting an Ionic colonnade, behind which is an attic crowned by a cornicione of appropriate dimensions and design. There is no concealment and no false construction anywhere, and the Classical details are used with truth and propriety throughout. Its principal defects are that the order of the portico is too plain and simple for the rest of the design. The unbroken entablature adds to this defect, and the attic over it is badly managed. When a large Order is used with a smaller, the first ought to be as ornate, and cut up into as many parts as possible, so as not to overpower its modest neighbour, and the



99.

The Museo at Madrid. From a Photograph.

smaller ought to be made, by simplicity of parts, to look as if it were only a smaller part of the larger. The opposite course has been followed here ; consequently a very good design fails to produce an effect to which it very nearly attained.

In the provinces there are occasionally to be found examples of the early Renaissance Art, as picturesque and as pleasing as any that exist either in Italy or France, and with that peculiar exuberance of detail that was so characteristic of the style in Spain. Few of these have yet been drawn with anything like exactness—few indeed have ever been described ; but if a more cosmopolite feeling should ever

prevail in Architectural Art, there are many examples here which may be considered as well worthy of admiration.

As an instance, the Carcel del Corté at Baeza (Woodcut No. 96) may be quoted, not as remarkable for either size or purity of design, but as possessing that indefinable grace arising from honesty of purpose and correct application of ornament to the parts where it is wanted. There is also a certain breadth of design, and a pleasing proportion between the solids and the voids which conduces so essentially to architectural effect.

It may be asked, where do the Grandees of Spain live? Surely



96.

Carcel del Corté at Baeza. From *Parcerias*.

their palaces ought to be commensurate with their pride, and present architectural features worthy of attention. The question is easier asked than answered. They certainly do not live in the country. There seems to be nothing in Spain corresponding with the English Park or French Château; nor is there, so far as is known, one single country-seat in the length or breadth of the land worthy of being commemorated. When not in Madrid, the nobles seem to live in the provincial towns near to which their estates are situated, but not in palaces even then; nor do their residences in the capital seem worthy of attention. Ford describes the façade of that of the Duke of Medina Celi as looking "like ten Baker Street houses put together," a descrip-



tion which, it is feared, is only too correct. If the others are in the same style, they may be very characteristic of the present position of the nobility of Spain, but must be beneath contempt as works of Architectural Art.

On the whole, perhaps, we should not be far wrong in assuming that the Spaniards are among the least artistic people in Europe. Great things have been done in their country by foreigners, and they themselves have done creditable things in periods of great excitement, and under the pressure of foreign example; but in themselves they seem to have no innate love of Art, no real appreciation for its beauties, and, when left to themselves, they care little for the expression of beauty in any of the forms in which Art has learned to embody itself. In Painting they have done some things that are worthy of praise; in Sculpture they have done very little; and in Architectural Art they certainly have not achieved success. Notwithstanding that they have a climate inviting to architectural display in every form,—though they have the best of materials in infinite abundance—though they had wealth and learning, and were stimulated by the example of what had been done in their own country, and was doing by other nations—in spite of all this, they have fallen far short of what was effected either in Italy or France, and now seem to be utterly incapable of appreciating the excellences of Architectural Art, or of caring to enjoy them.

## CHAPTER IV.

## PORTUGAL.

ARE there any buildings of Renaissance Style in Portugal worthy of note? If there are, they seem to have escaped the attention of artists and tourists. The old books represent a palace of some grandeur at Lisbon, with a splendid plaza in front of it, where, on state occasions, they used to butcher bulls and burn nonconforming Christians; but the earthquake seems to have swallowed it up, though, like Cromwell's Ironsides, who are made to account for so many of the crimes and shortcomings of churchwardens in our own country, this celebrated catastrophe has to bear the blame of so much that we are led to suspect that it was really hardly so destructive as it is said to have been.

Be this as it may, the Convent at Mafra seems to be the only really grand structure of Renaissance Style in the country. It was built in consequence of a vow made during a dangerous fit of illness by John V., from the designs of an architect named Ludovico, and said to be a German. He commenced it in 1717, and it was practically completed in 1732. Its dimensions are such as to surpass those of the Escorial, being 760 ft. east and west, and 670 north and south.

The church in this design stands in the centre of the principal façade, instead of being thrown back, as in the Spanish example, and, in consequence of being only of the same height, and not much grander in design than the domestic buildings which flank it on either side, it certainly lacks the dignity which the other possesses. In other respects it is, externally at least, very much superior to its rival. The flanking towers are more graceful, the dome better proportioned, its details are more elegant and appropriate, and it has the advantage of a magnificent flight of steps leading to its portals, so that, were it not that the wings overpower it, it ought, in every sense, to surpass the boasted creation of the bigot Philip. The rest of the building externally is also very much more pleasing than the Escorial, the domestic parts being broken up in masses, which prevent the cold monotony that destroys the effect of the Escorial, and, being generally only three—seldom four—storeys in height, it has a palatial air, which is entirely wanting in the seven and eight-storeyed palaces of Spain.



It is much to be regretted that this building is not better known, and has not been more carefully illustrated, for, though it has faults of detail—perhaps not a few—there is probably no palace erected in the eighteenth century which is so free from them, and which has a greater air of grandeur than this; considering, too, that, like the Escorial, it contains a monastery combined with a palace, the difficulties it presented to an architect were such as it was by no means easy to overcome.

If the Portuguese do not wish to be considered as the least artistic



97.

Palace at Mafra. From a sketch by Charles Landseer, R.A.

people in Europe, they would do well to publish some illustrations or statistics of the works of Art they possess. So far as is now known to the world in general, they never produced a painter or sculptor worth mentioning; they have no architect whose name is known out of his own country; and, considering their history, their former wealth and power, and their opportunities, they certainly have produced, in proportion, fewer buildings worthy of note than any other nation of Europe.

## CHAPTER V.

## RECENT ARCHITECTURE IN SPAIN AND PORTUGAL.

[THE series of illustrations already given affords so complete a presentment of the characteristic Architecture of the Peninsula as it still exists, that it appears to be unnecessary to offer any further examples. Modern Spanish design has always been of the Italian type, and continues to be so. The Latin susceptibility to the enjoyment of rich effects, coupled with the kindred influence of the southern temperament, shows itself in the same tendency towards Rococo, but with augmented force. Academic reserve is prominently absent. It may even be said, with perfect truth, that the Moresque spirit still has a very prominent place in Spanish taste. The internal troubles of politics in Spain have not failed to curb the aspirations of industry; and especially of Industrial Art, which can never flourish when to political decadence is added internecine warfare. Moreover, Spain and Portugal have had their day in the past—they are both behind the age. But they are by no means without hope for the future, and Architecture will record the realization when it arrives. Meanwhile it is, perhaps, enough to say that the ordinary modern European style of building prevails without anything that is notable being accomplished.—ED.]



## BOOK III.

## FRANCE.

## INTRODUCTION.

THE history of the introduction of the Renaissance Architecture into France differs in many essential particulars from that of its rise in Italy, as well as from that of its adoption in Spain.

In Italy it was a spontaneous growth, arising from circumstances which have been detailed in the foregoing pages. In France it was an importation from the South, after the style had acquired completeness and consistency in the land of its birth. The principal reason for its adoption in France was the revival of Classical literature, which had exercised so great an influence in its development in Italy. But more than this was the secondary cause, that the Art and artists of Italy had acquired a name and fame in the beginning of the sixteenth century which rendered fashionable whatever they did, especially in Painting and Sculpture. Had the Northern nations been content to emulate them in these two Arts only, all would have been well: the mistake was, their including Architecture in the same category. In the jubilant, unreasoning frame of mind that accompanied the great awakening of the sixteenth century, we should not be surprised at this want of discrimination, however much we may regret the result.

The campaigns of Charles VIII. and of Louis XII. had done a great deal towards making the two nations acquainted with one another; but it was not till after the memorable expedition of Francis I. that the French became thoroughly familiarised with Italy and her works of Art, and conceived the desire of rivalling her in her artistic career, even if they could not succeed in annexing her politically to their own kingdom.

Very little was done in this respect by either of the first-named monarchs; but Francis I. (1515-1546) was fairly bitten by the Italian mania of the day. One of the first results of his visit to Italy was to bring back Leonardo da Vinci to France; and he invited thither

Benvenuto Cellini, Primaticcio, and Serlio—men of note in their own country, all of whom were employed by him in the works at Fontainebleau, and elsewhere; and, although a number of Frenchmen were still employed on his undertakings, the influencing minds were the Italians; and the native artists laboured only to rival them in the style they were introducing. The consequence was, that during the reign of Francis the new style became thoroughly established, and long before the accession of Henry IV., the Gothic had come to be regarded as barbarous, and fit only for the Dark Ages.

Though thus introduced from Italy, the French adopted the new style with a very different feeling from that which had guided the Italians in its elaboration. The French had a perfect Gothic style of their own, to which they had long been accustomed to look with admiration, and which they had been gradually adapting to their more civilized wants, long before they thought of introducing the Classical style of Rome. Any one at all familiar with the Civil Architecture of the fifteenth century in France, knows how the Flamboyant style had been modified to meet the wants of the age. The openings had been made frequent and large, the windows square-headed, mullions had to a great extent been dispensed with, and generally the Municipal and Domestic Architecture was as elegant, and nearly as cheerful, as that which superseded it.

It would indeed be a curious subject of speculation to try and guess what the style would have become had no Roman remains existed, and had the French never crossed the Alps: probably not so very different from what it afterwards became. The pointed arch certainly would have disappeared; so would buttresses and pinnacles; wooden roofs would, to a great extent, have superseded stone vaults in churches, and the improvement which was taking place in figure-painting would probably have required the suppression of mullions and tracery in the windows. In Domestic Architecture, string courses would most certainly have been more extensively used to mark the storeys; balconies would have been introduced, for their convenience, and probably also cornices, to mark the eaves.

All this might have resulted in very much what we find now: except—and the exception is most important—that a mania would never have arisen for spreading a network of pilasters and three-quarter columns over every part of a building, whether they were wanted or not, and where they had not even the merit of suggesting a reason for their employment. It is useless, however, speculating on the past—it is sufficient to know that Gothic had become impossible, and that something very like the forms then adopted had become inevitable. We cannot, however, but regret that their introduction was accompanied by the trammels of a style foreign to their use, and which eventually so far got the mastery over the real artistic exigencies



of the art as to render it subject to those vagaries which have had so pernicious an effect on the Architecture of modern Europe.

The French Renaissance differed further from the Italian in this—that it grew directly out of the Gothic; and, instead of trying to copy Roman temples, or to rival their greatness, all the French architects



98. Façade of the Church of St. Michael at Dijon. From Lalonde, *Monumens de la France*.

aimed at, in the early stages of the art, was to adapt the details of the Classical styles to their Gothic forms; and, throughout France, a number of churches are to be found in which this is done with very considerable effect. The church of St. Michael at Dijon is as fair an average specimen of this class of church in France as that of San

Zaccaria (Woodcut No. 37) is of the Italian group ; the great difference being, that in the French example the form is essentially Gothic, though the details are Classic. In the Italian example there is nothing that would be called Gothic on this side of the Alps. In the church at Dijon every form is essentially Mediæval ; and the Classic details are applied without any constructive propriety, and, it must also be admitted, generally without any ornamental effect. At least, so we think now ; but it is easy to understand that, in the age in which it was built, it may have been considered a perfect example of Roman Art.

It frequently happens in France that the eye of the tourist is charmed by the effect produced by the outline of these quasi-Classical buildings—as, for instance, when contemplating the dome which till recently crowned the intersection of the nave and transept of the Cathedral at Bayeux, or the western towers of Matilda's Abbey at Caen ; and, though the Gothic purist is offended at such innovations, there is little doubt that they frequently were improvements, and might always have been so had a little more taste been displayed in the adaptation of the new forms.

Another point of difference between the French and Italian styles was that the earliest Renaissance buildings in France were palaces or châteaux, and nine out of ten of these situated in the country. Francis I. was no church-builder ; but all the energies, all the resources of the Art of his day, were devoted to Fontainebleau, and such palaces as Chambord, Madrid, Chenonceaux, and others of the same character. In these situations, where the building was required to group with the undulations of the country and the irregular growth of trees, or the adjuncts of outhouses, regularity would have been as inartistic as it was uncalled for. On the other hand, a Roman or Florentine palace, bounded on all sides by straight streets, could hardly be otherwise than rectangular ; and any irregularity would have been as impertinent as it would have been inappropriate. In the country, high roofs and a broken sky-line harmonized with the scenery, and gave elevation and dignity to a building that could be seen on all sides and at all distances. A high roof cannot be seen from a street, and a broken sky-line is lost when the spectator is close under a building. In fact, a Farnese palace would have been as much out of place on the banks of the Loire, as a Chambord would have been in the narrow streets of Rome, or a Chenonceaux on a bridge over the Tiber.

Another proof of contrast between the Arts of the two countries is the unity that marks the history of the art in France, as compared with that of Italy. In the former country we have no strongly-marked provincial peculiarities like those which distinguish the style of Florence from that of Rome, and both from what is found in Venice. The art was introduced into France by her kings ; and it was from Paris



—and from that city only—that all the designs proceeded which either influenced or were executed in the provinces. There are no local styles or local peculiarities which require remark. From the time of Francis I. to the present day, Paris has been the literary and artistic, as well as the political, capital of France; and the thread of our narrative may therefore be continuous and uninterrupted.

As the early stages of such a transition are those which it is always most difficult to understand, we are fortunate in possessing in the works of Androuet du Cerceau, published in 1576-79, during the reign of Henri III., a complete picture of the Architecture of his day, and as complete an indication of what was then admired or aspired to.

At the time he wrote, sufficient feeling for the old style still remained to induce him to illustrate Couci and Montargis, as two of the “plus excellents bastiments de la France;” but the Louvre and the Tuileries were the great projects and the most admired designs of that day. Next to these come Blois and Amboise, Fontainebleau, Chenonceaux, Madrid and Gaillon (since destroyed), Vallery and Verneuil, and the unfinished palaces of Charleville and Ecouen.

Another characteristic difference between the styles of France and of Italy, as well as between the old Gothic and the Renaissance, is, that among some thirty or forty buildings no church is illustrated in the works of Du Cerceau. In Italy the transition began with churches; and St. Peter's gave a tone to the whole style, and fixed its characteristics. In France, it is true, St. Eustache had been built, and St. Etienne du Mont restored, and various patchings and rebuildings had gone on; but kings and men of taste did not trouble themselves with these matters. The Crown gave the tone, and the Palace led the way, in Art. Hence, perhaps, much of the frivolity, but hence, also, much of the grace, that distinguished French Art as compared with Italian. In France we have not the great conceptions which so often redeem the faults of detail of the early Italian styles; but, on the other hand, we have a style generally of greater elegance, and which seldom fell into those exaggerations of detail which so often disfigure the designs of even the best Italian masters.

Although the Renaissance style was imported from Italy into Spain about the same time, and nearly in the same manner, in which it was introduced into France, the character of the two nations was so different that the same seed soon produced very different results. The early Plateresque style of Spain was based far more on the delicate and exuberant style of ornamentation introduced by the Moors, than on anything brought from Italy, or that is found in France; and was cultivated because in that age there seems to have been an immense desire to display easily acquired wealth without the corresponding power to realize grand conceptions, and which consequently found vent in

extreme elaboration of detail rather than in grandeur of design. This effervescence soon passed off, and the reaction was to the cold gloomy Greco-Romano style of Herrera and his contemporaries, at a time when the French were indulging in all the wild caprices of the *Henri Quatre* style. From this the French proceeded to the invention of the gay but grand and original style of the age of *Louis Quatorze*. The Spaniards stopped short in the career of invention, and became either copiers of the French or borrowers from Italy.




# CHAPTER I.

## ECCLESIASTICAL ARCHITECTURE.

### RENAISSANCE.

ALTHOUGH it cannot be said that church-building was either the earliest or the most satisfactory form which the development of the Renaissance Art took in France, it will be convenient, as in other instances, to take it first, having already enlarged sufficiently on the principles which guided the architects of that day in abandoning the old style for the more fashionable form of Classic Art.


One of the earliest—and certainly one of the most complete and best specimens of the Renaissance Style—is the well-known church of St. Eustache at Paris. The foundations were laid in 1532, though the church was not completed till nearly a century afterwards. Though thus commenced twenty-six years after St. Peter's at Rome, and carried on simultaneously, it is curious to observe how different were the principles on which the two were constructed—St. Eustache being in reality a Gothic five-aisled church in all essentials both of arrangement and construction, and it is only in the details that an experienced eye perceives the influence of Classical Art, and remarks the unhappy effect which results from trying to adapt the forms of a particular style to purposes for which they were not originally intended.



99. Plan of St. Eustache, Paris. From Lenoir, "Statistique Monumentale de Paris." Scale 100 ft. to 1 inch.

Notwithstanding this, it cannot be denied that St. Eustache is a very beautiful and elegant church. If its windows were filled with stained glass, for which they are, in fact, better adapted than the more heavily mullioned openings of purely Gothic buildings, and if its walls were relieved by painting, it would rival many buildings of the earlier age as a work of Art, though it might fail in that solemnity which should characterize a religious edifice. Its dimensions, too, are considerable, being 328 ft. from east to west, and nearly 150 ft. in general width, and 90 ft. in height to the ridge of the vault; and throughout it is impossible to point to a single detail which is not elegant—more so than most of those found in Gothic buildings—or to anything offensively inappropriate. Notwithstanding all this, the effect it produces is far

from pleasing. Everywhere the eye is offended by the attenuation—it might almost be called the wire-drawing—of Classical details, and the stilting that becomes necessary from the employment of the flatter circular arch, instead of the taller pointed one. The hollow lines of the Corinthian capitals are also very ill-adapted to receive the impost of an arch; and when the shaft is placed on a base taller than itself, and drawn out, as is too often the case here, the eye is everywhere shocked, the great difference being, that the Gothic shaft was in almost all instances employed only to indicate and suggest the construction, and might therefore be 100 diameters in height without appearing weak or inappropriate. In Gothic Art, the real construction was in the pier or wall behind it; but the Roman Orders were parts of the construction itself, and are only appropriate where they are so—when used merely to suggest it, they become ridiculous. The



100. Bay of St. Eustache. From Lenoir.

façade of this church was originally designed on the same principles as that of St. Michael at Dijon (Woodcut No. 98), and was partially executed in that style; but being left unfinished, it was completed in the reign of Louis XIV., in the more Classical form in which we now find it.

The church of St. Etienne du Mont is another Parisian example of this style. The rebuilding of this church was practically commenced in 1537, and dragged on through a long period, owing perhaps to the delay that must always take place when one part of a building has to be removed before that which is to replace it can be commenced. It is far from being so complete and satisfactory an example as St. Eustache, though, like it, St. Etienne is a Gothic church disguised



in the trappings of Classical details. The most remarkable feature about it is the Rood Screen, with the Staircases of the lightest open-work which lead up to it on either hand. This is a poetical and beautiful conception, but marred by the details being neither constructional nor elegant in themselves. The whole church would be very much improved by the introduction of colour, which evidently formed part of the original design, but nothing, it is feared, could ever reconcile the conflict between the two styles, which pervades the whole, and gives rise to such discrepancies as are everywhere apparent.


There is a church in Dieppe very similar to St. Eustache, and generally, throughout France, it is common to find repairs in the style of these two Parisian examples, in churches which, having been commenced in the fifteenth century, were continued during the sixteenth. All these quasi-Classical features were unmeaningly introduced in this pseudo-Gothic style, which was practically the only one employed in church-building in France during the course of that century; so that it is almost a relief to come to the downright introduction of Classical forms, in the position and used for the purposes for which they were, or rather were supposed to have been, designed. If it was necessary that Gothic Architecture should be abandoned, it certainly was not by this compromise that it could be worthily replaced. Any perfectly honest constructive forms would have been better than these Classical imitations; but, as that was not to be, it is with a feeling almost of satisfaction that we come even to the unmeaning tameness of the Louis Quatorze style of Ecclesiastical Art.

Before it settled down to this, the French architects adopted for a while almost literally the style introduced in Italy by Maderno,<sup>1</sup> Borromini,<sup>2</sup> and others of that class, and which, as before remarked, was disseminated all over Europe by the Jesuits. The church of St. Paul and St. Louis at Paris (Woodcut No. 101) is one of the most typical examples of this class in France. It was commenced in 1627, and finished in 1641. The façade is three storeys in height, and covered with the usual mass of unmeaning ornament. The general effect produced is rich and picturesque, but very unsatisfactory; pillars with their entablatures and the various other ornaments used being merely pieced together so as to cover the whole surface of the façade, without the least reference either to the purposes for which pillars were originally designed, or to the constructive necessities of the building where they are now found.

The interiors of the churches of this—which may be called the Jesuit style of Art—were not more satisfactory than the exteriors.

<sup>1</sup> Died 1629.

<sup>2</sup> Died 1667.



161. Part of Façade of Church of St. Paul and St. Louis, Paris. From *Benengarten*.

Such architectural mouldings, as were used were of the most contorted Rococo character. The sculpture employed consisted of sprawling figures of half-clothed angels, or of cherubs, or of saints, and was generally unsupported—or at least not sufficiently supported—by the construction, and the paintings which were interspersed with these belonged to the most theatrical and the least devotional style of Art which has yet been seen.

It was fortunate that this transitional style did not last long in France. But specimens of it are to be found in every capital in Europe where the Jesuits obtained a footing, and many of its forms are



so gay and so taking with a certain class of minds that traces of them are found long after the style has ceased to exist as a whole.

The Church of the Sorbonne, the first stone of which was laid in 1629, may be quoted as one of these examples which mark an epoch and complete a stage of transition. It was designed by Le Mercier,<sup>1</sup> under the orders of Cardinal Richelieu, and the greatest pains were taken, by consulting architects both in France and Italy, to make it as perfect as possible. It became in consequence a little St. Peter's, with the addition of some of those improvements which Palladio and others of his school had subsequently introduced into the style. It is a church of no very great dimensions, being about 150 ft. in length, and its dome 40 ft. in diameter internally. The western façade has the usual arrangement of two storeys, the lower one of Corinthian three-quarter columns, surmounted by pilasters of the same Order above, and the additional width of the aisle being made out by a gigantic console. The front of the transept towards the court is better, being ornamented with a portico of detached columns on the lower storey,



101. Jesuit style of decoration. From Rosenkranz.

with a great semicircular window above; and the dome rises so closely behind the wall that the whole composition is extremely pleasing. So it was evidently thought at the time, for it is illustrated in every contemporary book on Architecture, and praised as a *chef-d'œuvre* of Art.

Another very similar work was commenced for Anne of Austria, by François Mansard,<sup>2</sup> at Val de Grace, in the year 1645; but finished by other architects, and in reality presents no points of novelty to distinguish it from that last quoted. There are several other churches of the same class in the capital and its neighbourhood. Their style is that found in Italy as prevalent during the sixteenth century, though in

<sup>1</sup> Born at Pontoise; died 1660.


<sup>2</sup> Born 1598; died 1666.

France they may generally be taken as characteristic of the age of Louis Quatorze.

The one really remarkable building of this age which stands out from the rest, and is one of the most elegant structures of its class, is the Dome of the Invalides. It has the misfortune of being an after-thought, attached to a much plainer church, with which it is hardly in keeping, so that, though in reality only a part, it must be considered as a complete composition in itself. The dome was commenced in the year 1680 from the designs of Jules Hardouin Mansard,<sup>1</sup> and

completed, entirely under his superintendence, in the year 1706, and is considered as thoroughly the typical example of his genius as the dome of St. Paul's is considered the monument of Sir Christopher Wren.

In plan it resembles that of St. Paul's more than any other on the Continent, the four great piers which are universally employed abroad being placed so as to produce an almost octagonal effect, and are in fact pierced by doorways leading to the four lateral chapels; but these, as well as the openings into them from the transepts, are so small, that the chapels, being besides on a different level, do not seem to form part of the church. The area is thus practically confined to the limited space under the dome, with the transepts, instead of embracing the whole of the square, as it ought




163. Plan of the Dome of the Invalides at Paris. From Isabelle, \* *Edifices Circulaires*.  
Scale 100 ft. to 1 inch.

undoubtedly to have done. The pillars standing free in front of those piers produce a confusion which is far from pleasing; for it is evident that they do not support the masses above, and their prominence in consequence takes away from the solidity so evidently demanded. The small openings through the piers do not produce the same effect as was aimed at in St. Paul's of making the ground-plan truly octagonal, but, by restricting them to the dimensions here found, the four great openings are made half the width of the dome itself, which is far better than the proportion of 40 to 108, as is found in our

<sup>1</sup> Born 1647; died 1708.





164. Section of Dome of the Invalides at Paris. From Isabelle. Scale 50 feet to 1 inch.



185.

Façade of the Dome of the Invalides at Paris. From a Photograph.

example. The dome itself is 92 ft. in diameter,<sup>1</sup> and internally less than twice that dimension in height, which is also a more pleasing proportion than is usually found, both St. Peter's and St. Paul's being too lofty for the other dimensions of these churches. The eye, or opening, is very large, and above it is a second dome, which is painted, and produces a very pretty and pleasing, but very theatrical effect, unworthy of such a building.

The external dome above this is, like our St. Paul's, of wood, and so is the lantern, which deprives it of the dignity of that designed by Wren; but if a stone lantern could only be attained by the intro-

<sup>1</sup> The plan and section, with the dimensions quoted, are taken from Isabelle's 'Edifices Circulaires,' which is usually a most trustworthy authority; but I cannot help suspecting they are in excess. By most authorities the dome is made about

82 ft. in diameter, and this, on the whole, seems nearer the truth. Of eight or ten works I have consulted, no two agree on this point. The dimensions given range from 76 ft. English to 92.



duction of the cone which distorts the English example, Mansard used a wise discretion in refraining from attempting it. But, having done so, perhaps it would have been better to have adopted an avowedly wooden construction externally, instead of one meant to look like stone. The external façade below the dome, though possessing no great novelty, is well and harmoniously designed, though deficient in the simplicity of arrangement which is so essential a characteristic of all good architecture. On the other hand, the building being a Greek cross, and no part exaggerated, the whole is certainly one of the most pleasing examples of a domical building of this class in Europe, and wants a very little to make it one of the typical as it certainly is one of the most beautiful monuments of its class. It is true, nevertheless, that the introduction of two Orders, the one superimposed on the other, does detract materially from the dignity of the church, by making it appear two storeys in height. But the introduction of only one range of pillars below would have reduced the dome to being a mere cupola. As in this instance—more even than in our St. Paul's—the dome was intended to be the principal feature of the design, it was probably prudent to sacrifice the church to increase its dignity; in fact, adding one more to the numberless instances which prove how intractable the Orders are when applied to modern purposes.

The body of the church of St. Sulpice does not, except in its size, present any features worthy of notice. Internally, it presents the defect inherent in Palladian churches, where an Order designed for external purposes is used on the scale, and with the simplicity, which suits a large area exposed to the atmosphere, but which becomes offensively rude when applied to internal decoration, in a building which not only pretends to but demands elegance and richness of effect; the absence, however, of a dome at the intersection, prevents one part of the building from overpowering the rest, either by its height or its extent, and the interior consequently looks larger and is more harmonious than is usual in churches of this class.

The western façade, however, designed by Servandoni,<sup>1</sup> was added, in the middle of the eighteenth century, to the church commenced more than a century before that time from the designs of Le Veau; and, though not without faults, it is one of the grandest of modern Europe. The width of the porch is 205 ft., consisting of two Orders, superimposed on one another, and rising to the height of 160 ft. to the top of the balustrade. It is flanked on each side by towers, one of which rises 100 ft. higher than the portico, but the two, as carried out, differ in height as well as in design. The lower or Doric Order is doubled, not in front but towards the rear, thus giving great richness of effect, and great appearance of strength to the portico, and above this is an Ionic Order

<sup>1</sup> Born 1695; died 1766



166.

*Facade of St. Sulpice, Paris, as originally designed.*

of good proportions, with an arcade behind, standing on the rear rank of the lower columns. It would, however, have been better if the arcade had been on the lower storey, and if the Ionic columns instead had been doubled. All this makes up a composition not quite satisfactory, it



167.

*Plan of the Porch of St. Sulpice.*

must be confessed, but much more so than any of those above described as erected in Italy, certainly more so than any previous one in France : and very little more is, in fact, wanted to make it a very beautiful design. It is said that Servandoni originally proposed a pediment between the towers, but happily this was not carried out.

Another portico, somewhat similar, was added a little before this time to the cathedral of Auch ; but in this instance the towers are more important, and the centre too much subordinated, so as to want dignity and



to seem squeezed up between the lateral masses. The Order is Corinthian throughout, and the whole details so rich and so well designed as to produce a very pleasing effect, notwithstanding its incongruity with the Gothic cathedral to which it is attached.


None of the churches mentioned above can compare, either in beauty of design or in size, with that of St. Geneviève, or as it is more generally called, the Pantheon, at Paris; which, though smaller than St. Peter's, St. Paul's, and some others, may still fairly be considered as entitled to be ranked as the third or fourth of the great Renaissance churches of Europe.

It was commenced in the year 1755, in consequence, it is said, of a vow made by Louis XV. during an illness at Metz, but practically because the church of the patron saint of Paris, which stood immediately behind the present building, was not only falling to decay, but had long been considered as unworthy of its destination. After a considerable amount of competition, the design of Soufflot<sup>1</sup> was accepted, and was sufficiently advanced in 1764 to allow of the foundation-stone of one of the piers of the dome being laid by the king; but the building was not entirely finished until after the death of its architect in 1781. In consequence of its not being completed when the Revolution broke out, it was dedicated in the first instance to the "Grands Hommes" of France, instead of to God, or to the Patron Saint for whom it was originally designed.

The whole area of the church is 60,252 ft., or about that of an average-sized Mediæval cathedral; its extreme length being 362 ft., its breadth across the transept 267, and its height to the top of the dome 265 ft. The building is practically in the form of a Greek cross, surmounted by a dome in the centre 69 ft. in diameter internally, surrounded by four smaller flat domes, each 57 ft. in diameter. In front is a portico of fourteen Corinthian columns, of correct design, each measuring 60 ft. in height, being consequently one of the grandest porticoes erected in modern times; but the effect is painfully marred by the front columns being so widely spaced as to give an impression of extreme weakness to the entablature, which, being composed of small stones cramped together, looks feeble in execution when compared with the grandeur of the design. Another great defect is, that two of the columns are placed outside at each end of the portico, in a manner so unmeaning that it is difficult to understand how they came to be placed there; and the arrangement produces weakness and confusion to an extent to be found in no other portico of the same pretensions.

Beyond the portico the external walls of the church are plainer than are found in any other in Europe, the only decoration being the entablature of the columns which is carried round, and a band ornamented with

<sup>1</sup> Born 1713; died 1781.



108. Plan of the Pantheon at Paris. From Isabelle. Scale 100 feet to 1 inch.<sup>1</sup>

wreaths, &c., which corresponds with the capitals; but below them the wall is absolutely unbroken by even a single window, except in the rear, and is only ornamented by a group of plain pilasters on the angles. This is no doubt infinitely preferable to the Italian plan of introducing two or three storeys of windows and an attic; but it is equally extreme and almost equally objectionable, in the other direction. The best thing would have been to have allowed the great semicircular windows of the interior to be shown externally; or, if that were impossible, some windows, or niches, or panels—anything, in fact, that would have reproduced the richness of the portico—would have been an improvement.

The design of the dome externally is elegant and chaste, but on the whole very inferior to that of St. Paul's; the peristyle is weak, because

<sup>1</sup> Though both the plan and section are carefully reduced from Isabelle's plates, the scale of the plan is about one-twentieth in excess of that of the section: the latter, however, appears to be correct.






109.

View of the West Front of the Pantheon at Paris. From a Photograph.

unbroken, the attic too high, and the lantern too small and insignificant. It escapes, however, to a greater extent than any of its compeers (except perhaps the dome of the Invalides) from the objection that it stands on or rises through the roof; and a very little more would have made it satisfactory in that respect, but like everything else in the building, it nearly reaches, but always escapes, perfection.

On the whole, its internal arrangements are very superior to the external. No church of its class can compete with it in the elegance of its details, or in the appropriateness with which the Classical features are introduced. Except a certain degree of weakness in some parts of the vaulting, introduced purposely to show cleverness, there is no fault to find with any detail, and the general effect is more elegant and pleasing than that of any Classical church which has yet been erected. Yet, as in every other part of the design, it is easy to see how it might have been better. Practically, the arrangement is that of four equal and similar halls, surrounding a fifth, which, being of the same dimensions



108. Plan of the Pantheon at Paris. From Isabelle. Scale 100 feet to 1 inch.<sup>1</sup>

wreaths, &c., which corresponds with the capitals; but below them the wall is absolutely unbroken by even a single window, except in the rear, and is only ornamented by a group of plain pilasters on the angles. This is no doubt infinitely preferable to the Italian plan of introducing two or three storeys of windows and an attic; but it is equally extreme and almost equally objectionable, in the other direction. The best thing would have been to have allowed the great semicircular windows of the interior to be shown externally; or, if that were impossible, some windows, or niches, or panels—anything, in fact, that would have reproduced the richness of the portico—would have been an improvement.

The design of the dome externally is elegant and chaste, but on the whole very inferior to that of St. Paul's; the peristyle is weak, because

<sup>1</sup> Though both the plan and section are carefully reduced from Isabelle's plates, the scale of the plan is about one-twentieth in excess of that of the section: the latter, however, appears to be correct.






109. View of the West Front of the Pantheon at Paris. From a Photograph.

unbroken, the attic too high, and the lantern too small and insignificant. It escapes, however, to a greater extent than any of its compeers (except perhaps the dome of the Invalides) from the objection that it stands on or rises through the roof; and a very little more would have made it satisfactory in that respect, but like everything else in the building, it nearly reaches, but always escapes, perfection.

On the whole, its internal arrangements are very superior to the external. No church of its class can compete with it in the elegance of its details, or in the appropriateness with which the Classical features are introduced. Except a certain degree of weakness in some parts of the vaulting, introduced purposely to show cleverness, there is no fault to find with any detail, and the general effect is more elegant and pleasing than that of any Classical church which has yet been erected. Yet, as in every other part of the design, it is easy to see how it might have been better. Practically, the arrangement is that of four equal and similar halls, surrounding a fifth, which, being of the same dimensions



110. Section of the Dome of the Pantheon at Paris. From Isabelle Scale 50 feet to 1 inch.

in plan, though far superior in height, is not sufficiently dignified to be the centre of such a group. The mode in which four piers of the dome, with their accompanying pillars, are projected into the centre of the church, is very confusing, and the glimpse caught of the adjoining apartments behind them only adds to the complexity, without increasing the appearance of spaciousness.

It is evident that the object of the architect in adopting this arrangement was principally to display his cleverness in construction, and to seek to astonish the spectator by one of those *tours de force* which are so common with a declining art, but which are absolutely fatal to



true effect wherever introduced. In this instance it was very nearly entailing the destruction of the building ; for so soon as the centring of the great arches under the dome was removed in 1776, the piers began to show symptoms of weakness ; but it was not till the dome itself was practically completed in 1779 that this proceeded to such an extent as to cause any real alarm for the safety of the building. On a careful examination being made at that time it was found that the principal cause of the failure arose from the faulty character of the masonry. The stones of the piers were truly and correctly worked only to a depth of about four inches from their face ; the rest being roughly hewn and carelessly filled up with cement, so as to throw the greater part of the strain on the face of the pier. This was to some extent remedied by cutting into the joints with a saw, so as to relieve the pressure on them, and to throw it more on the centre. This was partially successful ; but the mischief went on to such an extent that serious fears were entertained for the stability of the building, and in 1796 a commission of architects was appointed to examine into the matter, in the following year one of engineers, and a third combined commission in 1798 ; but the danger was such that no one could suggest a remedy, and after four years' debate it all ended in shoring up the great arches and leaving the building to its fate.

In 1806 M. Rondelet was appointed to repair the damage ; he found that the piers had contracted to the extent of nearly six inches English ; partly from crushing, partly from the sawkerfing of the joints in 1779. He at once set about replacing the damaged stones, and added also considerably to the mass of the piers, as shown in the woodcut, where the shaded part shows the pier as originally executed, the outline as it now stands. This was so successfully accomplished that no sign of weakness has since displayed itself in any direction, while at the same time the appearance of the church has been very much improved by the greater solidity given at the point where it was most wanted for effect.



It is easy to see that the way in which all this might have been avoided would have been by setting back the piers of the dome against the angles of the building, and so increasing its size to a little over 100 ft. This the building could easily have supported, both internally and externally ; and had it been done, as an interior it would have been unrivalled for architectural effect, while all the difficulties of construction would have been got over by the additional mass that could have been obtained without interfering with the effect, and the support that would have been afforded by the junction with the outer walls.

This would, of course, have involved a rearrangement of the vaulting of the roof, and perhaps also the bringing forward of the columns, so as to make real aisles, instead of the narrow intercolumniations now

existing. This, however, so far from being a defect, would probably have been a great improvement in the design. As it at present stands a great degree of confusion arises from the continued breaks in the cornice, and the consequent want of unity and repose in the design. It would also have been an improvement if the eastern dome had been transferred to the nave, converting the plan from that of a Greek to that of a Latin cross, so that from the principal entrance the effect would have been of continually increasing grandeur and magnificence, till the high altar was reached, which, in that case, would have stood under the centre of the great dome.

All these points were successfully attended to in the Abbé Haffre-  
ingues church at Boulogne (ante, p. 44); and it is curious to observe how a plan which, both virtually and artistically, is far superior to the metropolitan example, was utterly spoilt, because those appointed to carry it out had hardly mastered the rudiments of the language in which they were trying to express their ideas. On the other hand, how the most refined and exquisite piece of Classiciality fails permanently to please, from the want of any great or correct intellectual conception underlying its polished surface.

The columns of the internal peristyle of the dome being plain, while those below are fluted, and the general poverty of the details of this important feature, as compared with that of the rest of the building, produce a disagreeable effect, but one which could easily be removed by colour. This, in fact, is an addition which the whole building requires. It is too light, too gay, for a church; but if the great semicircular windows were painted, and a moderate degree of tone introduced by colour in other parts, it might be conceded, as many are inclined to admit, that it was, in spite of the defects in arrangement just pointed out, the most beautiful interior of any modern church of Classical design.

### REVIVAL.


At the time when the Pantheon was erected, it was considered the perfection of Classical imitation, and the greatest pains were taken that every part and every detail should be correct and supported by authority. Before it was completed, however, it came to be believed that perfection could only be obtained by copying the forms, as well as the details, of extinct buildings, and consequently, as early as 1773 designs were prepared for an absolutely Classical building on the site where now stands the church of the Madeleine. Nothing, however, was then done, and the present edifice was commenced in 1804, from designs by Vignon. The dimensions are very considerable, being a rectangle measuring 350 ft. in length by 147 in width, and consequently covering more than 51,000 square feet. Externally it is, to all



appearance, a perfectly regular octastyle peripteral temple of the Corinthian Order. As nearly as may be, its columns are of the same dimensions as those of the Pantheon, but placed more closely together, though, on the other hand, being built of smaller blocks, they are as deficient in constructive dignity as the others. Internally, the clear space is 85 ft. by 280, divided, after the manner of the halls of the Roman baths, into three spaces by Corinthian columns bearing arches. Each of these three compartments is surmounted by a flat dome, pierced by a skylight in the centre. At the north end is the apse, at the south a vestibule, and there is a range of chapels and confessionals round the sides ornamented by a smaller subsidiary Order.

Taking it altogether, the arrangement is probably the best that could be adopted under the circumstances, and the whole church has internally an air of considerable grandeur and appropriateness to the purposes of the Roman Catholic ritual. As it now is, however, the light is barely sufficient, and the paintings, with the coloured marbles and an excess of gilding, produce a spotty and inharmonious effect, which time may cure, but which at present gives it more the air of a ball-room than of a place dedicated to religious worship. If this church had been used as a nave leading up to a solid square block, occupying the whole width of the peristyle, the three domes and fourteen pillars on each side would have had all the Classicality and beauty of the present edifice. If a great triapsal dome, not less than one hundred feet in diameter, had then been added to the northward, it would have converted the whole into one of the grandest Christian churches in the world, and given it the height and dignity it requires, without essentially interfering with the Classical effect its design is intended to produce.

Externally it is hardly open to criticism as a Christian church, for which, in fact, it was not originally intended by its designers. It is, however, so exact a reproduction of a Heathen temple, that it affords an opportunity of judging how far the Romans succeeded in attaining to beauty and dignity in their temples; and in this respect they have



112. Plan of the Madeleine at Paris.  
Scale 100 feet to 1 inch.

nothing to fear from an impartial criticism on their respective merits ; but in order to arrive at these it would be necessary to consider the Madeleine as placed on an eminence above the neighbouring buildings, or standing in a piazza surrounded by houses of one, or at most of two, low storeys in height, and not, as this is, by dwellings of six or seven storeys high and of the most obtrusive architecture. It is here, indeed, that the Madeleine fails. It is too low, too simple, and too modest for its situation, and no spire or campanile, if attached, would help the matter. It is, in fact, unsuited to a situation in the centre of so tall a town as Paris ; but, nevertheless, it must be considered—barring some minor defects scarcely worth mentioning—as a very beautiful building. Its design will hardly, however, be repeated ; for if there is one thing which the experience of the Gothic architects settled more completely than another, it is that height and variety of outline are necessary to afford dignity to public buildings in towns ; and their practice shows how easily and how successfully this could be accomplished.

Hittorf was therefore right when he added two towers to the façade of his Basilican Church of St. Vincent de Paul, which, after those mentioned above, is perhaps the most important of the modern churches of Paris. It is very Classical and very correct, and no fault can be found with any of its details ; but somehow or other it is not a success, and, like most of the modern churches in Paris, fails entirely in producing the effect which is aimed at and expected in these edifices.

Recently two very important churches have been completed in Paris, which being neither in the Classic nor Gothic style may enable us to estimate to some extent what we may expect if we abandon their trammels and venture on the broad field of original design. The first of these, La Trinité, at the end of the Chaussée d'Antin, is a large and sufficiently ornamented church, in the style of the early Renaissance of the age of Francis I. Its proportions are good, and the tower, surmounted by a tall dome which adorns the southern façade,<sup>1</sup> is of pleasing design, and well proportioned to the position it occupies, while the interior is well lighted and richly ornamented ; but with all this the design fails to please. We can admire the struggles of an architect like the designer of St. Michael's, Dijon (p. 215), who is trying to escape from the rudeness of his own style, and striving to reach the elegance of an art he only imperfectly understands, while his earnestness makes us forgive him the blunders he commits in consequence ; but when, in the nineteenth century, an

<sup>1</sup> Fortunately for their architectural designs the French have not the same superstition with regard to orientation as

the English. Many of our best modern churches are ruined by being turned the wrong way.



architect affects deliberately to go through the same process, we see at once that he is only acting, and cannot feel any real enthusiasm for his work, however clever it may be.

The other church of St. Augustin, in the Boulevard Malesherbes, is in many respects better. Owing to the nature of the site it is wider in rear and in front, and if the architect had met this difficulty by successive rectangular offsets, he would have given strength, with light and shade, to his building; as it is he has sloped the sides away at a considerable angle, and so produced that weakness of effect inherent in architecture to all obtuse angles. In the interior the defect is entirely avoided. The sides of the great nave are parallel, and the difference of width only observable in the increased size of the side chapels. This also has enabled the architect to terminate his nave in a great dome, under which the high altar stands, which is practically the only true and effective mode of arranging the plan of a Christian church.

Externally the design of the church fails, from the total want of any depth in the reveals of the windows or accentuation in the parts, which, added to the sloping sides, destroys all true architectural effect. But, again, in the interior this is not felt. The construction is practically of iron. Iron vaulting shafts supporting iron ribs, between which is a roof partly in brick partly in wood, but all showing truth in construction with considerable elegance in detail. Many things might be better, but it seems a step in the right direction which, if persevered in, might lead to a great success. As neither of these attempts can, however, be said to be very encouraging, it will be curious to observe how far the modern French architects may succeed in their present attempts to reproduce, for ecclesiastical purposes, the Architecture of the Middle Ages. They commenced the attempt long after we had become familiar with its effects, but hitherto, notwithstanding their cleverness, they have certainly not been successful.

One of their most ambitious attempts is the church of St. Clothilde—Place Belle Chasse—in Paris; and, though its dimensions are those of a small cathedral, it looks poor and insignificant internally, and the exterior has neither the solidity nor the picturesqueness which is always found in old the buildings, and which our English architects have sometimes successfully imitated in their reproductions. The new cathedral at Marseilles, however, promises to be successful; and Notre Dame de la Bonne Secour, near Rouen, and many of the village churches recently erected, show how rapidly the French are progressing in their imitative efforts; and the task of copying is so easy, and so entirely independent of intellectual exertion, that there can be little doubt but that, when they have collected and drawn a sufficient number of models, they will repeat them with a correctness that will deceive all but the initiated. It is only to be wished that they would apply their money

and their talents to some better purpose, and, above all, that they would refrain from designing façades according to the newest Parisian fashion for such buildings as St. Ouen at Rouen, and many other remarkable and interesting edifices, which have lately been made to look as good as new, at the expense of those qualities which really give meaning to a building, and speak to the heart of mankind through all succeeding ages.

Barring this, however, and a few other similar mistakes, the very extensive repairs of the Mediæval churches of France which were carried out during the late Empire were generally characterised by good taste and judgment. Like all restorations of old buildings, it is true, they have wiped out much of the poetry which was one of the greatest charms of these buildings, and have obliterated or obscured much of the history which was so plainly legible in their structure. But at the same time it must be confessed they have removed many hideous excrescences and blemishes, and such substantial repairs have been executed as will enable the fabrics to resist the destroying influence of time, without which many of them might soon have been reduced to ruin.

[THE CONSERVATION AND RESTORATION OF ANCIENT BUILDINGS. —It is well known that the Gothic school of architects and archaeologists in England have for a long time strongly disapproved of the way in which the French restore their ancient edifices, and especially their churches. Of late years also the English manner of restoration has itself been almost still more urgently denounced at home. There are thus before us now three modes of dealing with historical edifices which are going to decay. The first is to renovate them as the French do; the second is to reinstate them as the English have been doing; the third is merely to "maintain, uphold, and keep" them in a condition of strict authenticity. Of course there is a great deal to be said for each of these systems. The method of the French is quite characteristic of the national sentiment; for they scarcely care in anything to sacrifice the convenience, and especially the presentableness, of the moment, for the sake of ideal conservatism. And certainly, when they neatly scrape off the corroded cuticle of a building, they are quite entitled to say that they have left the building itself where it was, and indeed that they have put it into the original and desirable guise of a real authenticity, in place of an acquired and undesirable condition of decay which it is a mistake to call identity, being only old clothing. The extreme doctrine of the English anti-restorationists, on the contrary, takes it for granted that the crust of age is the chief element of authenticity, to be retained at all hazards; and this, again, is characteristic of the national feeling. It is quite in accordance with even the loosest form of our insular traditions that there has sprung up amongst us a sort of transcendental conservatism—incidentally allied to sentimental æstheticism—



whose highest ideal of archaeological virtue is the demonstrative preservation of all the conditions of weather-worn dilapidation and decrepitude absolutely intact. In this view of the case, not only is it a sacrifice of authenticity to put a clean face upon an old building, by removing, however carefully, the soiled surface, but it is a sacred duty to preserve in absolute integrity the decay and almost the dirt, and to repair only so far and in such a manner as that preservation strictly requires. Not one stone must on any account be replaced by a new stone; the surface may be "made good" with some succedaneum, but nothing more must be done. A piece of decayed woodwork must be left as it is, propped up and protected from injury, but nothing more. That a broken pane of really old glass may not be renewed it is equally easy to say; and that a new drain may not be put in where it is sorely wanted almost goes without saying. The principle, in short, seems to be this:—that our worship of genuine antiquity shall extend so very thoroughly to the preservation of its remains as articles of curiosity, that if the owners of an old mansion, or the parishioners of an old church, can no longer use it with comfort, they must either submit to the discomfort or go away; in the latter case providing a fund for the perpetual protection of the abandoned possession. Of this doctrine it is enough to say that it is no doubt founded on generous feeling, but must not be allowed to oppress us. The ordinary English restoration system takes up a position between the extremes, and all it needs is judicious application. An ancient edifice may be put into such substantial repair as to serve its uses—reasonably rehabilitated, reinstated, renovated, perhaps improved. If all this be done with a rational feeling of respect—not an irrational feeling of veneration—the "restoration" may be achieved without perceptibly compromising either the authenticities on the one hand or the utilities on the other. But of course the success of such an operation in withstanding criticism, which in any case may appeal to such imaginative sentiments, must always be uncertain.—Ed.]

## CHAPTER II.

### SECULAR ARCHITECTURE.

#### RENAISSANCE.

THE history of Secular Renaissance Architecture in France may be conveniently divided into four great sections, distinguished by the name of the sovereign most prominent in encouraging Art during each of the epochs.

The first, extending from the accession of Charles VIII. (1483) to the death of Francis II. (1560), lasted seventy-seven years, and may be distinguished as the *Era of Francis the First*.

The second, commencing with the accession of Charles IX. (1560) and extending to the death of Louis XIII. in 1642, lasted eighty-two years, and may properly be called the *Age of Henri Quatre*.

The third, dating from the accession of the Grand Monarque (1643) and extending to the Revolution (1792), lasted, consequently, nearly 150 years; and is properly marked as that of *Louis Quatorze*.

The fourth, from that period to the accession of Louis Napoleon, may be designated as the *Revival*, or the *Period of the Empire*, and may even be extended to the present day; or the reign of the Third Napoleon may be treated as an Appendix to the epoch of his great uncle.

#### ERA OF FRANCIS I.

	A.D.		A.D.
Charles VIII. .. .. .	1483	Henry II. .. .. .	1547
Louis XII. .. .. .	1498	Francis II. .. .. .	1559
Francis I. .. .. .	1515		

Whatever may be the defects or deficiencies of the Ecclesiastical Renaissance Architecture in France, she possesses in her civil buildings a series of examples, certainly far more extensive than any other country of modern Europe, and which may also probably compete successfully in artistic eminence with those of almost any other country, not excepting even Italy.

The immense accession to the power of her kings, from the consolidation of the empire, and the peculiarly monarchical institutions of the country, enabled—it may almost be said forced—them to rebuild the



old châteaux of the feudal ages on a scale commensurate with the wealth and power acquired subsequently to the accession of Francis I. in the year 1515. The consequence was that the beautiful new palace of the Louvre, with its accompanying château at the Tuileries, succeeded to the old confined fortalice bearing the first name, as the residence of the kings in the capital. Fontainebleau supplanted the royal hunting-seat at Vincennes ; and Chambord succeeded Plessis les Tours on the banks of the Loire ; while St. Germain, St. Cloud, and other palaces, were erected, one after the other, in the neighbourhood of Paris, till they culminated in Versailles, the greatest and most splendid of modern palaces, though perhaps not the most successful as an architectural design.

The nobles were not backward in following the example of their kings, whose power and prosperity they shared. One by one the old feudal castles disappeared, and were replaced by more commodious and more suitable châteaux in the country and palaces in the towns, so that, between the accession of Francis I. and the death of Louis Quatorze, the Architecture of ancient France had nearly disappeared, in so far as the residences of her kings and nobles were concerned, and was replaced by a series of country seats and palaces more numerous and more splendid than those possessed at that time by any other country, and combining in many instances the picturesqueness of the Gothic with the elegance of the Classic styles, to an extent not found elsewhere.

Of the other class of civil buildings they had little to destroy. Except in the Flemish provinces, the cities had hardly any municipal institutions which could give rise to much architectural magnificence. Whether we admire or not the Town-halls and Palais de Justice which are now found in most of her cities, we have not at all events to regret the destruction of those which preceded them, as we should do if Belgium and Flanders had replaced their municipal edifices by others in the fashionable style of the age of Louis Quatorze.

In their extent, in their richness of decoration, and the amount of wealth lavished upon them, it is probable that the civil and palatial buildings erected in France during the last three centuries and a half exceed considerably the ecclesiastical and feudal edifices which were built in that country during a like period anterior to the year 1500. But unfortunately it is impossible to institute such a comparison between the two classes, as artistic utterances, as would lead to any satisfactory conclusion. All the Art in the world could never elevate a palace, with all its domestic and social arrangements, to the same scale as the great hall of a cathedral, devoted only to the performance of a ceremonial of the highest and most ennobling class. No splendour in the residence of a noble can compete with the simple grandeur of a great monastic institution, where all the grosser and less elevating characteristics of human nature are at least kept out of sight, instead of being made more

prominent by the luxury and frivolity by which they attempt to disguise themselves in the palace ; and the old, real, independent sovereignty of the municipality in the Middle Ages expressed itself with a manly vigour that cannot be found in the last new design sent down from the Home Office at Paris.

Besides this real difference in essence, came the more superficial difficulty of style. It is true that the French architects were never so completely enslaved to the Orders as the Italians became after Palladio, or the English after Inigo Jones ; but they felt the chain, nevertheless, and would have done much better had they never known the influence of the Italian school, or tried to reproduce the glories of ancient Rome. The absurdity they committed was in fancying that the best way to ornament modern buildings on the banks of the Seine was to cover them all over with shreds of ornament from ancient edifices on the banks of the Tiber. Although, therefore, the Renaissance Civil Architecture of France belongs intrinsically to a lower class of Art than the Ecclesiastical Mediæval Styles, and is further vitiated by the imitative being introduced to replace the constructive element, which is so essential in all true Art, it is still a style so elegant, so gay, and so characteristic, that its study will well repay any attention that may be bestowed upon it, provided it is entered upon without adopting the narrow class prejudices which are the bane of modern Art criticism.

### THE LOUVRE.


If not the greatest, certainly the most successful undertaking of Francis I. was the rebuilding of the Louvre. It had always been the principal residence of the kings of France in their capital, but had become so confined and utterly unsuited to the wants of the age, that there were only two alternatives—either to begin a new palace altogether, as Catherine de Medicis did a little further west at the Tuileries ; or to pull the old one down, and rebuild it. Francis decided on the latter plan, and invited the celebrated architect Serlio to furnish details for the new palace. It is not easy to ascertain how far the ordinance of the present building was influenced by his designs ; but it seems certain that the actual architect was Pierre Lescot.<sup>1</sup> He virtually made the drawings, and superintended their execution ; but the whole arrangement is so beautiful, and the details are so elegant, that it is difficult to believe that any native architect was its sole author, at least if one may judge of what was done in France about this time and afterwards.

It is not quite clear when the rebuilding was actually commenced, but the part begun by Lescot, and completed in 1548, was the south-

---

<sup>1</sup> Born 1510 ; died 1578.





113. Plan of the Louvre and Tuileries, distinguishing the periods at which the various parts have been completed.

west angle, from the Pavillon de l'Horloge down to the river-face (Woodcut No. 114), and consists of two storeys of Orders each about 30 ft. in height—the lower Corinthian, the upper Composite. These are surmounted by an attic storey, only half the height of the two below it. Throughout the whole, the details and profiles are singularly correct for the age; and the ornamental parts, having been sculptured from the designs of Jean Goujon, not only heighten the effect of the architecture, but are in themselves worthy of all praise. The same ordinance, in all essential particulars, has, at subsequent periods, been carried all round the court, with the important addition and improvement that, instead of the attic, a third storey, adorned



114


Pavillon de l'Horloge and part of Louvre Court. From Rosengarten.

with an Order, has been substituted on the three remaining sides. This not only gives greater height and dignity to the whole design, but admits of its terminating in a cornice, which is an essential element in all good designs in this school. An attic, however elegant it may be—and the French school cannot boast of one more elegant than that of the Louvre—has always more or less the appearance of an afterthought or of a makeshift; and one of the greatest difficulties of modern Italian Architecture is how to accommodate the bedrooms and other offices without having recourse to it. When the Orders are used, an attic may, in some cases, be indispensable for utilitarian purposes; but it cannot be doubted that a building with a cornice crowning the whole is a very much better design in an architectural point of view. Although the entablature of the upper Order of three sides (Woodcut No. 115) of the Louvre Court is only in proportion to its own height, and not a



cornicione proportioned to that of the whole building, its introduction adds very much to the beauty of the composition.

In comparing it with the great courtyards of the palaces of Italy or Spain, the one criticism that occurs is, that it wants light and shade. If either the lower or the upper storeys had been open arcades, or if loggias had been introduced anywhere, it would have relieved a monotony which is rather strikingly apparent. Perhaps the most pleasing arrangement would have been arcades in the lower storeys of two opposite sides, and an open gallery on the upper storeys of the other two façades, with three open arches in the centre of the



115.

Part of the Court of the Louvre. From Mariette's *'Architecture Française.'*

principal storey of each face. Some such arrangement as this seems, in fact, to have formed part of the original design, and in the older works (as shown in Woodcut No. 115) it is always represented with open arcades in one or other of the storeys. Considering that its dimensions are nearly 400 ft. each way, something of the sort was wanted to relieve its monotony; but even as it now is, whether we take its dimensions, or its richness of ornamentation, or the beauty or appropriateness of its design, it is certainly the most beautiful court belonging to any modern palace in Europe.

If we can in fancy assume a third storey added to the courtyard of

the Great Hospital at Milan (Woodcut No. 75), and its dimensions in plan increased to such an extent as to bear this without disproportion, we might have a fair means of comparing one of the best and most typical Italian examples with one of the best to be found on this side the Alps. Of course the difference of climate accounts for the greater part of the difference in design, but not altogether. If the Milanese court consisted of three tiers of open arcades, it would fail architecturally, from want of solid parts, as much as that of the Louvre does now from want of some open loggias or arcades to give variety of light and shade. They are both extreme examples of their respective styles—both very beautiful—but each would have been better if it had adopted, to some extent at least, the principles of the other. If, for instance, one-third part of the arcades of the court of the Hospital had been designed as solid, and a like proportion of the arcades of the Louvre left open, the gain in effect would have been considerable, and each of these designs would still have been appropriate to their climate and the exigencies of the case.

But, notwithstanding this and some other minor defects which might be pointed out, the Court of the Louvre is a wonder of elegance and good taste, as well as of exquisite proportion, especially when we consider the age in which it was executed, and it has not been surpassed by anything which has been done either in France or in any other country of Europe since its time.

#### CHÂTEAUX.


The palace at Fontainebleau is to the reign of Francis I. what Versailles was to that of Louis XIV.—the palace of his predilections and the place on which he loved to lavish his treasures, and where he thought he was reproducing the glories of Classical Art.

In this instance there is little doubt but that Italians were mainly employed. Rossi and Primaticcio seem to have been permanently engaged; Serlio was certainly consulted, and Vignola sojourned two years in France, to assist the king in his architectural designs. But the result is curiously unlike anything Italian, or anything we should expect from these men. The plan is as irregular as anything in Gothic Art, and there is a picturesque *abandon* about the whole design which is very charming and appropriate to the situation; but, strange to say, the effect of the whole is marred by the coarseness and vulgarity of the details. There is nothing offensive or exaggerated in the use of the "Orders;" but there is not a well-proportioned column or a well-profiled cornice in the whole building. When rustication is employed, it is so used as to be unmeaning, and the window-frames throughout are very badly designed. It is difficult to understand how this could happen in a country where only recently the Flamboyant architects



had almost ruined Architecture by over-delicacy and lace-like work in their details, and where the king was trying to imitate the even more elegant style of the Classical age, and under the direction of Italians, who, whatever their faults of design might be, seldom in their own country erred from coarseness or vulgarity of detail. But they fell into this error here; and, whether from intention or not, it is certain that the defects of detail mar what otherwise would be the most poetic, as it is the most picturesque, of French palaces.

We turn almost with pleasure from the ill-understood Classicality of Fontainebleau to the thoroughly French design of Chambord, com-




116.

Plan of Château de Chambord. From Durand.

menced by the same king, in 1526, immediately on his return from his Spanish captivity. The design is so essentially French, that, although its details are generally Classical, they are kept so subdued, and subordinate to the whole, that they scarcely interfere with the effect—certainly not more so than the details of St. Eustache, which leaves that still as essentially a Gothic church as this is a Gothic château of the country where it stands.

The château itself consists of a cubical square mass, measuring 220 ft. each way, from outside to outside of the four great towers that adorn its angles. This is situated on one side of a court surrounded by buildings. These are of the same height as the central



Chateau of Chambord. From Rosengarten.



mass on that side which it occupies ; on the greater part of the other three sides, only one storey in height ; and at each angle there is, or rather was intended to be, a great circular tower, similar to those attached to the main building. Measuring over these, the dimensions of the building were 520 ft. by 390. The whole was surrounded by a terrace overhanging a broad and deep moat. The central building was divided into three nearly equal storeys in height, but by cornices so subdued as to be little more than string courses ; and the upper one projected so as to carry a balcony all round the main building. It was divided vertically into an infinite number of equal panels, by pilasters of the Corinthian Order ; an arrangement which would have been singularly monotonous in most cases, but which in this instance is entirely relieved by the very varied outline of the building, and, more than that, by the different way in which they were treated—many being left blank, some filled in with arcades, and many with square-headed windows—so that few buildings possess more of that unity with variety which is so charming when properly employed in architectural composition.

The most singular and the most characteristic part of the whole design is the roof, which rises to a cone, surmounted by a cupola, over each of the towers, and in square masses over the rest. The whole is relieved by dormer windows of very elegant design, and chimneys, which are more ornamented and more ornamental than in almost any building erected either before or since. The whole is crowned by a central tower of domical form, but wholly of open work, containing a richly ornamented spiral staircase.

If we attempt to judge this building by the loftiest canons of architectural criticism, it would be easy to find many faults in it ; but, taking it for what it is—a château in a flat country meant to be seen over and to group with a park of ancient trees—as a hunting-seat of a gay Court, unconscious of any very lofty aims—it conveys an impression of truthfulness, combined with elegance, which we look for in vain in many works of more pretension of later times.

The palace or château of Madrid, in the Bois de Boulogne, at Paris, is another production of the same age, the loss of which is more to be regretted (it was destroyed in the Revolution) than that of any other building of its period. From the drawings of it which exist, it seems to have been of remarkably elegant design, and to have approached more nearly to the palatial requirements of the age than almost any other.

It was not very large, being only 265 ft. in length by 112 ft. wide, but it was four storeys in height, and divided into three nearly equal blocks by square towers at each of the angles, and two in each face. Standing on a good bold basement, the two lower storeys were covered by arcades of very elegant design, broken only by the towers ; and

variety and relief were given to the whole by the centre being recessed. The roof, though high, was far from being excessive; and the chimneys were treated as an essential part of the design. If we may judge from the testimony of those who have seen it, and, more than this, from the representations that still exist, there was certainly no building for its size so palatial, or to which the Transitional style was more happily applied, though it had not the picturesqueness of Fontainebleau, nor the semi-feudal grandeur of Chambord. As an exterior, however, it would probably have at least been equal to the fragment of the Court of the Louvre, which was in course of being erected simultaneously, and almost in sight of this building; while its



open arcades give it exactly that degree of shadow and relief the want of which is so much felt in the Louvre.

The buildings described above are all more or less exceptional in their arrangements; but, in the private chateau of Bury, near Blois, we come on a type which more or less distinguished all the seigniorial mansions of France, both in town and country, and even the royal palaces, when they were not on a scale too grand to admit of it. In this example, as in most others, the principal *corps de logis* (tinted darker in the plan) is opposite the entrance, looking into a square court in front, and opening in the rear upon a garden. Opposite the centre of the garden front is a chapel, which was generally omitted in future designs. At each angle is a circular tower, as at Chambord: but the circular form was found so inconvenient internally, that it was




afterwards changed to a square block, when actual fortification was no longer required, and even the suggestion of it became obsolete. On each side of the court are two long wings, containing offices and servants' apartments; and these are joined in front by a screen wall, solid externally, but covering an open arcade internally, and, in the centre of this, the *porte-cochère*, or principal entrance, on which the French architects of that and of all subsequent times have lavished all the resources of their art.

With slight modifications, this became the type of all French châteaux. Where the main building was three storeys high, the wings were generally two; where the main building was only two storeys in height, the wings were generally only of one, except in towns, where, for very obvious reasons, they were frequently carried as high as the rest. Where a palace was occupied by only one owner, or where it was situated in a remote or quiet part of the town, the same arrangements prevailed as in the country; but where, as is generally the case in Paris, the main building is occupied by a different family on each floor, the wings which contain the offices, &c., belonging to each suite of apartments, are necessarily as high as the rest. In

towns, also, the front is generally occupied by shops on each side of the *porte-cochère*, and its situation renders it too valuable for places of business, or for another class of lodgers, not to cause it to be carried up on the side towards the street as high, or even higher, than the rest of the building.

With such modifications as these, the type of a French mansion is as fixed as that of a French cathedral; and, whether in the country or the towns, they are objects of great beauty. Their courts may want




119.

Plan of the Château de Bury.

the beautiful arcades which are so graceful and so appropriate in the climate of Italy, but their designs are infinitely preferable to the cubical arrangements of English mansions.

To return, however, to the Château de Bury. Its façades are divided, like Chambord, into rectangles by small Corinthian pilasters; and these are occupied, either alternately or in groups, by square-headed windows, or by panels, with a device in the centre; and everything is balanced with so much appropriateness that the effect is as pleasing as in any design of that age. The arcade on each side of the principal entrance to the court is composed of Corinthian pilasters, with arcades between, the whole being of pleasing proportions, and elegant in their detail.

Considerable additions were made during the reign of Francis I. to the castles of Blois and Amboise. The staircase and the wing, in the centre of which it stands, at Blois, are among the most admired, or at least the most frequently drawn, of the works of this age. It owes its



120. Château de Bury. From Mariette, '*Architecture Française*.' Scale 60 feet to 1 inch.

attractions, however, more to its adherence to the principles of the past than as an earnest of the future; and the building on each side of it hardly varies from what is found at Chambord and Bury.

Chenonceaux is to be admired from the extreme picturesqueness of its situation on its lake, standing principally on a bridge in the water, rather than from any excellence in the design and details: and that part of Chantilly which belongs to this period merely repeats what is so often found elsewhere.

The most unhappy effort of the Art of this age is the gloomy pile of St. Germain-en-Laye, almost wholly Gothic in design; the Classical features which are spread over its buttresses and arcades serving merely to deprive them of their constructive propriety of appearance without suggesting any feeling of Classical Art. The same thing, it must be confessed, occurs rather frequently in smaller and less important examples; but, on the whole, the style of the age of Francis I. may be considered



as one of the best examples of the Transition to be found anywhere. It is true it entirely misses the grandeur of the early Florentine or the exuberance of the Venetian style, but it is always gay and elegant. Though adopting Classical details, it retains its originality, and mixes with singular felicity the picturesqueness of the Gothic with the simplicity of Classical arrangements. As a general rule, its details are marked with elegance, but with a tendency to over-elaboration, arising from the circumstance of the architect frequently encroaching on the domain of the painter, and introducing forms and details which, though beautiful as painted arabesques, are not such as should ever be carved in relief on more monumental materials.

There are in France very few municipal or civic buildings of this age. It is essentially a palace-building epoch, and churches and Hôtels de Ville are mere exceptions. One of the earliest of the latter class is that at Orleans, which was commenced at least during the fifteenth century, and offers a curious and interesting specimen of the very earliest introduction of Classic forms. It is more picturesque, however, than beautiful. All the details are elegant, and combine many of the beauties of both the parent styles ; but neither used appropriately in this example, being jumbled together in most admired confusion. It is interesting, however, as exemplifying a transitional style peculiar to France. Neither in Italy nor in England is there anything similar. It could only have sprung out of the Flamboyant style, which had already squared the heads of its windows, and adopted many of the forms of the Renaissance, before it was thought necessary to carry them out with details borrowed from the Classical styles.

The other municipal example of this age is the well-known Hôtel de Ville of Paris, which in style far more resembles the contemporary buildings at Fontainebleau ; all traces of Gothic details having disappeared from its design, and very little of the Gothic feeling remaining in its outlines. It was, however, an eminently picturesque building ; and even now, though enveloped in one of the most successful designs of modern times, it holds its own without much detriment to the general effect.

The thing, however, which perhaps pleases most in the Architecture of this age, is the beauty and general appropriateness of the details. Except at Fontainebleau, the Classical features, when introduced, are treated with almost Flamboyant delicacy, and men had not yet learned to think that copying the forms of one incongruous building could improve the design of another. For centuries they had been designing buildings only with reference to their purposes, and adding details only from their appropriateness ; and it requires a great deal of teaching before men can forget this, and adopt an entirely new principle of Art. Although, therefore, they might be enamoured of Classical forms, they could not at once forget that details were only a mode of expressing

more strongly certain constructive or artistic forms of the building to which they were applied ; and it did not then occur to the architects to use them, as was afterwards done, as extraneous adjuncts, without reference to the edifice to which they were added : in the Woodcut No. 121, for instance, representing one bay of the Archbishop's Palace at Sens ; where, although all the details are Classical, or nearly so, it is impossible to say that any one is either inappropriate or mars the




121. Bay of the Episcopal Palace at Sens. From Sauvageot, *'Palais, Châteaux, &c., de France.*

general design. The upper pilasters cannot be dispensed with, if the lower range is to be employed, which seems an indispensable part of the arcaded forms below ; and the way in which their lines are carried through by a console, gives them all the continuity of a buttress, with more than its usual grace.

The other example, from a façade added to a house traditionally called that of Agnes Sorel, at Orleans, exemplifies the same principle



In this instance, the arcade being supported on single columns, their work and their design could not be well carried through by a mere ornamental pilaster. They are working members of the design, and are left to tell their own tale their own way; and to the Classical features is left the purely ornamental task of framing the windows and relieving the monotony of the flat surface of the walls. The one thing that appears to have been omitted is a console over each pilaster to support the cornice. The frieze in consequence seems blank and unmeaning,



122.

House of Agnes Sorel at Orleans. From Verdier and Caillols.

and the design is certainly considerably marred by the want of a bolder cornice more directly connected with the lower part of the façade.

From the examples just quoted, it is evident that the French architects had quite abandoned Gothic art as barbarous, but were at the same time embarked in the dangerous enterprise of trying to copy a style they did not understand. In the next age—that of Henry IV.—the effect of this was painfully felt; but, generally speaking, the buildings of Francis I. are tolerably free from vagaries. The annexed woodcut, however, from the Hôtel Vogüé at Dijon, will explain how

the temptation was working. It is very rich and beautiful, and in its style hardly to be found fault with; but it is evident that, though architects may adopt such forms and such details as these with the idea that they are Classical, yet when they do so they have dropped the bridle that ought to restrain architectural forms to their true function of expressing construction, and that only, and there is then no limit to the extravagances they may attempt, or the strange forms they may introduce.

This, however, is on the very limits of the style of Francis I., and can hardly be said to be a defect of his age. The defect of his buildings is the want of grandeur of conception and mass, far more than faults of detail; and this is probably owing more to the fact of all




123.

Window-head, Hôtel Vogué, Dijon. From Sauvageot.

the buildings of his reign being palaces and châteaux of a more or less domestic character, in which it is vain to look for anything approaching to grandeur or sublimity. They only pretended to be what they were: and though this was one of their greatest merits, the general effect was to lower the standard of architectural excellence even more than any errors of detail could possibly have done. The true spirit of the style was perhaps best seen in France, as well as in Spain, in the shrines, tombs, altars, and smaller objects of decorative art, where the designers, being freed from all constructive necessities, could indulge their fancies without restraint. There is scarcely any important church in France where there is not to be found some richly-carved specimen of screen-work, like the tomb of the Cardinal



d'Amboise at Rouen. Frequently the details are so elegant, and the effect so rich, as almost to disarm criticism; but the result is never equal to the labour bestowed on such works; and even when merely screens, the total forgetfulness of constructive propriety generally



124.

*Canopy of Tomb of Cardinal Amboise at Rouen. From Rosengarten.*

spoils the effect, and the incongruity between the materials employed and the forms used is so apparent, that the result cannot be permanently satisfactory. These defects, however, are not nearly so offensive in screen-work as they would be in buildings of a more permanent or monumental description.

## CHAPTER III.

## STYLE OF HENRY IV.

Charles IX.	:: :: ::	1560		Henry IV.	:: :: ::	1589
Henry III.	:: :: ::	1574		Louis XIII.	:: :: ::	1610

As explained above, during the reign of Francis I. the "Orders" were kept in pleasing subordination to the exigencies of the construction, and the ornaments were generally elegant and not inappropriate; but almost immediately after his death the architects seem to have thrown off all restraint. Great Corinthian pilasters sprawl through two or three storeys of windows; as a general rule a window cuts through the entablature of the Order; circular pediments alternate with triangular ones, and both are frequently broken for no object but to produce variety; rustication takes the most fantastic shapes, while griffons and monsters of all sorts appear in the place of more appropriate details. The great *débâcle* of taste arrived at its culminating point in the reign of Henry IV., during which the architects seem to have fancied that perfection was to be attained by uniting the grotesque picturesqueness of the Gothic with the gigantic features with which Michael Angelo had overlaid his pseudo-Classical constructions. It was some time, however, before Architecture fell to the depths it then reached, and during the reign of Louis XIII. was gradually recovering, and forming itself into the purer style of the Grand Monarque.

The most extensive undertaking of the earlier part of this architectural epoch was the building of the Tuileries, commenced in 1564 by Catherine de Medicis, from designs by Philibert de Lorme.<sup>1</sup> The original plan has been preserved by Du Cerceau, and shows that it was intended to have been a rectangular block, measuring 860 ft. north and south by 550 east and west. In the centre was to have been a square court, as long, but not quite so wide, as that of the Louvre; and two smaller courts on each side, divided in the centre by galleries, enclosing smaller courts of elliptical form.

In so far as the plan is concerned, there is nothing to object to, but the whole building seems to have been designed to be only one

<sup>1</sup> Born in Lyons; died 1578.






126. Central Pavilion of the Tuilleries, as designed by De Lorme. From Marietta.

storey in height, with an attic of gigantic dormer windows. With such lineal dimensions as those quoted above, so low a building must always have looked mean and insignificant, even when relieved by a pavilion like that designed and executed for the centre; which is far from being commendable in its general outline or in its details. All that can be said in its favour is, that there is a general thoughtful appropriateness about the design which pleases, and which characterises the epoch, though it has little other merit.

Only the garden façade was completed by its foundress—the courts were never even commenced; and the defects of what was completed were rendered doubly apparent by the erection, during the reign of Henry IV., of the two great unsightly pavilions (one of which is shown in Woodcut No. 127) which now bound it, designed by the architect

Du Cerceau. Not only did their erection extend to nearly 1000 ft. in length, a façade already too long for its height, but, by their mass and the largeness of their details, they crushed the prettinesses of De Lorme's design into double insignificance.

It was in order to correct these two glaring defects that Louis Quatorze raised the whole façade between these two blocks to three storeys in height, and remodelled the centre to what it recently was.



126. Portion of the Façade of the Chateau Gaillon. From Du Cerceau.

It thus happens that very little of De Lorme's design remained, and nothing enabling us to judge of the effect that he intended to produce. Whatever its merits may have been, it certainly was injured by the additions of Henry, far more than it was improved by the alterations of Louis; these have, however, made it one of the most picturesque, though certainly it is far from ranking as one of the most beautiful, façades in Europe. Without the softening hand of time, and the prestige which history has given, it could hardly be spoken of in terms of sufficient reprobation as an architectural design.

Contemporaneously with the earlier buildings of the Tuileries, Charles IX. commenced, at a place he called Charleval, in Normandy, a palace which, if it had been completed on the scale in which it was designed, would have surpassed all the palaces then existing in France in size and stateliness of arrangement; but, in so far as we can judge from the plates of Du Cerceau,\*the style of the details was such that France may congratulate herself that no such monstrosity


disfigures her soil. It is impossible to conceive anything more fantastic or vulgar; and it is difficult to conceive how French taste could ever have sunk so low as to admire such a thing as this.

One specimen (Woodcut No. 126) must suffice to illustrate the style, though unfortunately the examples are only too common, and not only rival but surpass the absurdities of the Jacobean age in our own country. It is taken from the Chateau Gaillon, a building of the latest Gothic age, but which was added to and beautified at this



period in the style then fashionable. At the present day we can hardly understand how architects could desert the constructive propriety and elegance of detail of the Middle Ages for such a style; still less how they could fancy they were reproducing Classic Art when they did so. But it was so, for nearly all the most admired buildings of this age were decorated with details as bad as this, if not worse.

Besides the two pavilions called *De Flore* and *Marsin*, which Henry IV. added to the façade of the Tuileries, he commenced, in the same style, the great gallery that connects the Louvre and the Tuileries, and which may be taken as a fair specimen of the best



127. Pavillon Flore of the Tuileries, and part of the Gallery of the Louvre. From Mariette.  
Scale 50 feet to 1 inch.

Architecture of his day. Its general character will be understood from Woodcut No. 127, representing the pavilion at its junction with the Tuileries, and the position of the galleries adjoining it. It is adorned with great Corinthian pilasters, 40 ft. in height, which have no reference either to the structure externally or to the arrangements of the interior. As usual also, the entablature is cut through by the windows; and a series of pediments, alternately semicircular and straight-lined, give a broken line, which aggravates instead of mitigating the overpowering heaviness of the roof. The architects seem to have proceeded on the idea that largeness of details would give size and dignity to a building; whereas, had they cast their eye on any

Gothic structure, they would have seen that the truth lay exactly in the opposite direction, and that smallness of parts and details, combined with simplicity of arrangement and of mass, are the true secrets by which the effect they were aiming at could alone be obtained.


It is with pleasure we pass on from these aberrations of Du Cerceau and Duperac to the return of soberer taste which marks the designs of Lemercier;<sup>1</sup> for though little remains of what he erected at the Palais Royal, we have, at the Sorbonne and elsewhere, the germs of that style which characterised the following epoch.

Perhaps the most satisfactory building of this age is the palace of the Luxembourg, commenced shortly after 1611, by De Brosse, for Marie de Medicis. It is so sober that one would be startled to find it

belonging to that date, if it were not that it was built for a Medici, who insisted that the Pitti and other palaces of her beloved Florence should form the key-note of the design.

In plan it is essentially French, consisting of a magnificent *corps de logis*—shaded darker in the plan—315 ft. in width by 170 in depth, and three storeys in height, from which wings project 230 ft., enclosing a courtyard, with the usual screen and entrance tower in front.

The greatest defect of the design is the monotony of rustication which is spread over



129. Plan of the Luxembourg. From Mariette.

the whole, from the basement to the attic, and covering the pillars as well as the plain surfaces. It is true it is not used here with the vulgarity which so frequently characterises the rustication of the previous reign, but with something of Italian elegance; and the architect has taken great pains, by the boldness of his masses, and the variety of light and shade he has introduced everywhere, to

<sup>1</sup> Born at Pontoise; died 1660.



justify its employment, and has sought to relieve the monotony of detail by the variety of outline. He has done this with such success that even now there are few palaces in France which on the whole are so satisfactory and so little open to adverse criticism.

In Louis Philippe's time a large addition was made to the main *corps de logis* of this palace, in order to fit it for the reception of the Chamber of Peers. With great good taste the new part was made exactly similar to the old, but the effect has been, by increasing its



129.

Elevation of a portion of the Courtyard of the Luxembourg.

breadth, to make the whole design more squat than it originally was, and to increase the lowness, which is really its principal defect. This effect, too, has become more apparent in modern times, by the increased and increasing height of the new buildings of Paris. Even now it would not be so apparent if the whole building had been crowned by a cornice. When the principal feature is at the top, the eye is carried at once to the highest point, and the design gets the full benefit of all the height it has; but when the principal feature is one-third of the way down, all there is above counts for but little in the general design.

It is surprising that Marie de Medicis did not insist on the introduction of a cornice, as it is the great characteristic of Florentine design. Even if she had done so, the taste of the French architects would probably have been too powerful for her; for throughout the whole range of French Architecture there is scarcely a single example of a façade with a well-profiled or well-proportioned cornice; and in nine cases out of ten there is some sort of attic above the cornice. Where it does crown the building—except in such absolutely Classical designs as the Madeleine, for instance—it is proportioned only to the Order, not to the whole elevation, and consequently is never integrally a part of the entire design.

It would be well if this were the only, or the greatest defect that could be pointed out in the Architecture of the age. It is unfortunately one of the most venial; the real deficiency of the style being, that the details introduced are seldom elegant, and are generally gross and grotesque. They neither aid nor express the construction, and the whole designs are as far removed from the constructive propriety of the Gothic as they are from the elegance and grandeur of the Classic styles which the architects so strangely thought they were reproducing.



## CHAPTER IV.

### STYLE OF LOUIS XIV.

Louis XIV. . . . 1643.      Louis XV. . . . 1715.      Louis XVI. . . . 1774.

---

So soon as the French architects of the early part of the seventeenth century had time to compare their performances with those of other countries, it was almost impossible they should fail to perceive that they had not hit on the right path in their endeavours to endow their country with a new style. Their works had neither the original nationality of those of the reign of Francis I., nor had they the elegant Classicality which had been attained in Italy in the works of Palladio, and others of his school. It was consequently open to them either to go back to the point where the style had been left half a century earlier, and to try and recreate a national style, or to adopt the principles so successfully carried out in Italy.

Knowing how essentially the tendencies of that age were towards Classical forms, not only in learning and in literature, but in Art also, it is easy to surmise that the architects of the day would adopt the same principles which had been introduced into Italy, and that, during the reign of the Grand Monarque, the style which was then assumed to represent the Architecture of Imperial Rome would become the prevailing fashion.

At the present day we are so fully imbued with the love of the picturesque, and admiration for everything that even savours of Mediævalism, that it is difficult for us to understand how the architects of the age of Louis Quatorze could forsake the picturesque style of Francis I., to adopt the cold, formal arrangements of their day. When, however, we place the buildings of the two ages in immediate juxtaposition, as we are able to do in such an example as the view of Blois (Woodcut No. 130), we see at once what the architects were aiming at, and why they took the means they did to arrive at it. Though the new part may now appear to us cold and formal, there is a largeness about the windows which betokens a well-lighted interior, a height between the floors indicating spaciousness in the apartments, and a general simplicity and elegance of design which, especially when new, must have produced a most pleasing effect. However picturesque

the earlier buildings might be, the storeys were low, the windows small, and anything like stateliness or grandeur inside was impossible. It must also be borne in mind that it is the inside of the house or palace which is important; and, consequently, when stateliness and grandeur were aimed at, larger and more regular designs were indispensable.

To this must be added the greater familiarity with, and increased admiration for, the literary works of the Classic ages; and the con-



130. Part of the Château de Blois. From Laborde, '*Monumens de la France*.'

sequent desire to rival, by copying them, which pervades the literature even more than it does the Art of this age. It requires only the most superficial knowledge of the works of Corneille, Racine, Boileau, and the other great writers of that day, to be aware how essential it was assumed to be to copy literally the forms of Classic literature; and the general idea of reproducing Rome seems to have pervaded every utterance of the people; but the success of the attempt was nearly alike in all cases. Racine did not become Euripides, Boileau did not rival Horace, nor Louis the Grand either Julius Caesar or Augustus; nor did the architects of this age do more than



masquerade in the flimsiest and most transparent shreds of Classical disguise.

In the example of Blois *we* know now that the imitation is not perfect; but *they* did not then know it; they believed that they had beaten Vitruvius and rivalled the best productions of the Augustan age, and the French architects have consequently proceeded boldly from the design of the Tuileries to that of Versailles, from Versailles to the Louvre façades, and from that to the Bourse and the Madeleine; and being unable to go further in that direction, the pendulum is now swinging backward towards—what?


#### VERSAILLES.

The great apostles of this new revival were the two Mansards—uncle and nephew—Italians by descent, but neither of them men at all equal to the opportunities which were thrown in their way. Had the younger, Jules Hardouin,<sup>1</sup> been a man with one spark of creative power—one ray of genius—he might have produced such works as would have made an epoch in the art; as it is, the elder invented the ugly style of roof which bears his name, and the other, at Versailles, stamped mediocrity and almost meanness on the largest and most gorgeous palace of Europe.

It is generally attempted to excuse Mansard's failure at Versailles by referring to the difficulties he had to contend with: first, in having to include in his design the old hunting-seat of Louis XIII., which his son and successor would not permit to be destroyed. If any estimate of the merit of the design were to be made from the appearance of the entrance front, this excuse would be just; but this is not the case here, as the front is so broken up and composed of so many small incongruous parts, that it is never taken into account in speaking of the architectural design of this palace. The old château is a small brick building, with stone dressings, in the quaint style of the preceding reign. As a hunting-box of a king, it is as interesting as any portrait in the grandes perruques and voluminous costumes of the age; but is so unworthy of its site as quite to take the entrance front of the palace out of the category of an Art design.

It may also be said that the design of the new palace is due in some respects to Leveau, who had charge of the works from their commencement, in 1664, till his death, in 1670. So far, however, as can now be made out, his labours were chiefly confined to the repair and adornment of the old château, so as to fit it for the residence of the king, with such additions as were requisite for the increased splendour of the court. But the garden front, which is really the palace, in so far as Architecture is concerned, seems to be wholly of Mansard's design,

<sup>1</sup> Jules Hardouin Mansard, born 1647; died 1708.




and was practically completed by him from his own designs about the year 1685. The central part had, it seems, been occupied by the king and the court from the year 1681.

The situation of the palace is as favourable as can well be conceived. It stands on a rising ground, so that you ascend towards it from whatever side you approach it, and still, so gently as nowhere to necessitate any change in the design to suit the locality. It is true the terraces of the garden are so arranged as to hide the palace the moment you descend the steps in front, and, so far from adding to the height or giving dignity to the mass, they rather detract from it; but this is the fault of the architect, or of Le Notre, who laid out the garden. By making the terraces narrower, and breaking them so as to follow the lines of the building, they might have been made to give it that elevation and dignity which it now so much wants. The ground was admirably adapted for this; it consequently is a very serious reproach to those who had charge of the design that they did not know how to profit by it.

The dimensions of this palace are probably unsurpassed by those of any in



ancient or modern times. The central projection measures 320 ft., and each wing about 500, so that its length is 1320 ft. in a straight line north and south. As the central block projects forward 280 ft. in front of the wings, the whole façade really measures 1880 ft. It is this projection which alone saves it from being as undignified a Terrace as exists in any town in Europe. There being no variety in the design, and nothing to compare it with or give a scale, it looks like an ordinary row of street houses three storeys in height. Only with considerable difficulty, and after a great deal of thought, can it be ascertained that it is larger and taller than any ordinary mansion, and is, in fact, a palace of colossal dimensions. The lower storey is rusticated throughout, and pierced with circular-headed openings of one design, and of one



132. Section of Great Gallery and part Elevation of central block, Versailles.

dimension, whether they are used as windows of bedrooms or carriage entrances through the building, to both which purposes they are here applied. The principal storey is adorned with an Order, used sometimes as pilasters, at others as columns standing free; but the pillars are so widely spaced as at a distance to give the idea that, if the architrave is of one stone, they must necessarily be very small; and on a nearer approach, when you see that each is composed of a number of small pieces cramped together, the whole has an appearance of meanness most unworthy of the situation. Over this is an attic which ends in nothing. Had it borne a deep cornice, it would have gone far to redeem the whole. But there are fifty ways in which the design might have been saved. Any bold projection on the angles, any towers or domes to break the sky-line, any variety in the wings to give scale, would have effected this; but the flat monotony of design in such

a building is one of the greatest architectural crimes of modern times.

Internally, the design is as objectionable as that of the exterior. The entrance is mean; there is no portico, no grand hall, no staircase worthy of such a palace, no vestibule, or any arrangement that would impart either dignity or poetry to the whole. So much is this the case, that very few persons are probably aware where the principal entrance really was, and fewer would believe if told that it was only an insignificant doorway on the right-hand side of the *Cour Royale*, near the principal staircase.

The Grand Gallery, with the square vestibules at either end, extending along the whole of the centre of the garden front (320 ft.), is certainly one of the most gorgeous apartments in Europe—rich in marbles and in decorations; but it is only a gallery 35 ft. wide and 40 ft. high, and is not a hall or a room with any point of interest in it. Architecturally, it is a passage that ought to lead to some more splendid apartment; it is without a vestibule or staircase leading to it, and it leads to nothing.

All, perhaps, that can be said in favour of the design is that, though it is commonplace, there is in it no glaring offence against good taste; and no part of it can be said to be a sham, or to pretend to be other than it really is. Rustication is only used in the basement; the Order is well profiled, and never runs through two storeys, or where it might not be legitimately used; and the attic is such as might be indispensable in such a palace. It was, however, a strange perversion of Architectural propriety, in order to make the centre uniform with the wings, to carry the glazed attic over the Order along the central part of the garden front, where the great gallery occupies the whole height above the basement. Had an Order 40 ft. in height been introduced here, it would only have correctly expressed the internal arrangement (Woodcut No. 132), and would have been just what was wanted to give this part the dignity it lacks. The most ordinary fault of architects of the present day is that they attempt to make buildings of three or four storeys in height look as if they were only one or two; but both at St. Peter's at Rome, and at Versailles, the fault has been, throwing away the dignity obtained from singleness and largeness of internal parts, to make the building look as if it was composed of a larger number of small apartments. Of the two faults the latter is the greater. To aim at grandeur, even if not quite legitimate, is far nobler than to court littleness where grandeur really exists.

This uniformity, more than any real defect of design, destroys the effect of the façade at Versailles. It is impossible to believe that all the 1800 ft. of frontage are alike taken up with stately galleries and apartments; and the mind feels almost instinctively inclined to



adopt the opposite scale of all the rooms being small, and is justified in so doing, as the architect has himself chosen the meaner instead of the grander scale as the keynote of his design. By repeating the same features over and over again throughout a façade twenty times the length of its height, he has gratuitously used all the resources of his art to make that look mean and insignificant which is in reality grand and magnificent.

### LOUVRE.

The completion of the Louvre was the next greatest undertaking of the reign of Louis, but carried out under happier auspices than prevailed at Versailles. It seems that François Mansard was first applied to by Colbert, but, refusing to accede to his terms, Bernini was sent for from Rome. His designs have been preserved, but, most fortunately, not executed; and France may congratulate herself that nothing so horrible was perpetrated. Had they been carried out, instead of possessing one of the most beautiful, she would have had only one of the most vulgar and least artistic palaces of Europe. Marot and Lemercier also presented designs, which, though certainly less objectionable than Bernini's, only tend to show with how much justice that of Perrault<sup>1</sup> was preferred before those of all the other competitors.

Although brought up as a medical man, Perrault seems to have had an intuitive taste for Art, not only beyond that of his contemporary architects, but also beyond the age in which he lived; for no design of that day can at all compete with the eastern façade of the Louvre in true appreciation of the exigencies of Classical Art. It is unfortunate, however, in being turned towards the east, where the sun only reaches it in the morning, and where there is not space enough to allow of its being properly seen. It ought to have faced the south, and been the principal façade towards the river, instead of the very tame and commonplace design which now occupies that position.

At the present day, when we are so much more familiar with the examples of Classic Art, and with the principles on which they were designed, than any one could be two centuries ago, it is easy to point out defects in the Louvre façade. The basement is not bold enough for its position; it ought either to have been rusticated, or the openings more deeply recessed. There is nothing in it to suggest the intention that a colonnade of so bold a character should stand upon it, and nothing that connects it in any way with the superstructure. Its great defect, however, is that it entirely hides the lower part of the

---


<sup>1</sup> Born 1613; died 1688.

wall at its back. In the upper storey the columns are avowedly merely an architectural screen; the wall behind them is the main wall of the building. In the basement storey the front wall becomes the principal one, and the other seems to run down through the centre



Plan of Facade of the Louvre. Scale 100 feet to 1 inch.

133.



Eastern Facade of the Louvre, Paris. Scale 100 feet to 1 inch.


134.

of the rooms below, in some uncomfortable manner, which cannot be guessed at from the outside. This is about as great a mistake as could well be made—one of the first rules of the art being, that whatever is not seen must be accounted for; it ought either to be brought



down to the ground, or some device shown by which it can be made to stand. Here the main wall is lost; perhaps it may be only lath and plaster, and stand on the floor—or it may be supported on a glass case, like a London shop-front—at all events, there is nothing shown which satisfies the mind that the building is truly and honestly constructed, and the effect is unsatisfactory in consequence.

The upper part of the central mass not being recessed is another mistake, which detracts seriously from the beauty of the design, and renders the pediment that surmounts it, if not ridiculous, at least unmeaning and uncalled for; and the manner in which the circular head of the principal portal rises above the bases of the columns, cuts up the composition, and throws an air of falsehood over the whole. Instead of introducing masses of masonry behind the central columns,



135.

Central Compartment, Northern Façade of Louvre.

they ought to have been doubled—quadrupled—for real architectural effect, carried almost through the building—in order to justify the colonnades on either flank, which, without some such arrangement, are unmeaning, though beautiful. The design would also have been probably better, if, instead of coupling the pillars, they had been equally spaced. For this, however, the reason was obvious: it was to free the fronts of the windows, which occur only between the larger openings. One other defect, though it is one the architect was not responsible for, is that the façade is too long for its height, being 565 ft. long, and only 95 ft. high to the top of the balustrade. The solid masses at the angles break this to some extent, and a bolder projection or deeper recess in the centre would have done more; but what really was wanted was some tower-like masses to break the sky-line,

and to give that height which is so indispensable for dignity in such a situation. Its greatest defect, however, is that we cannot help feeling, in spite of its many beauties, that it is after all only an architectural screen—a something put there, not because it was wanted, or because it was essential to the design of the building, but in order to suggest something that had no reference to the purposes of the Louvre, or of the age in which it was erected; notwithstanding this, however, it has not been surpassed in modern times, either for elegance or propriety.

Taking it all in all, perhaps the north front is the most satisfactory of the three outer façades. It is singularly plain, having originally stood in a narrow street, where it could hardly be seen at all, and having practically no ornament but rusticated quoins at the angles, and a happy disposition of the windows and openings throughout. Yet, with these slight and inexpensive adjuncts, it is both pleasing



136.

Château de Meudon, Garden Front.

and satisfactory; and, with a little more ornament bestowed on the same parts, it might rival the eastern nearly to the extent to which that surpasses the southern façade.

Mansard designed and erected the Palace at Meudon very much in the same style as the northern façade of the Louvre. On the front it is only two storeys in height, and is not quite satisfactory; but on the other side, where the ground falls to such an extent as to allow of four storeys, very considerable dignity is attained; and, being without any pillars or pilasters, it avoids all those shams which so often disfigure the designs of the age. It is impossible to study this building and the northern façade of the Louvre without feeling that this was the true style of the age; and if the architects had only persevered in cultivating it, they might have produced something as beautiful as it was appropriate; the one great reform wanted being that, instead of carrying rustication on the angles up to the cornice, and repeating it everywhere, they should have substituted square piers of equal



boldness, and panelled them. This would have relieved their rudeness, which we cannot help feeling is not quite appropriate to palace architecture. The principal defect in the design is that the cornice at the top belongs to an Order which appears in the upper or two-storeyed façade, and is consequently not of sufficient importance for another of twice its height; but this unfortunately is one of those consequences it is so difficult to avoid when Orders are employed in modern buildings at all; and neither the Louvre, nor indeed any French building of this age, is entirely free from what may be considered as an inherent defect in the style.

The Château of Maisons, built by François Mansard about the year 1658, is one of those happy designs which would seem naturally to



137.

Château de Maisons, near Paris.

have linked together the style of Francis I. with that of Louis XIV., had not the nightmare style of Henry IV. intervened. As it is, it is almost as Classical in its details as the works of his nephew. It combines the playfulness of outline which prevailed at an earlier age with a strict adherence to the proprieties of the Orders as then understood.

The roof is enormous, but relieved by the chimneys, and by being broken into masses; while the whole effect of the design is that it is the house of a nobleman, of singular elegance, neither affecting templar grandeur nor descending into littleness. The great defect of the designs of Versailles and the Louvre is their want of variety, especially in their sky-line, and that is happily avoided here, and in a manner that was seldom more successful in this age.

## HOTELS.

There was scarcely any of the great families of France who, during the age of Louis Quatorze, did not rebuild their hotels in the capital, on a scale befitting what was then the proudest aristocracy of Europe, and in a style of magnificence commensurate with the splendour of the court to which they were attached.

Many of these hotels have been destroyed, and some converted into Government offices, or applied to meaner purposes; but still many remain, and all possess a strongly-marked individuality of character, and a largeness, almost sternness, of design, in strong contrast with the gaiety of their interiors.

These palatial residences of the nobles of France are far from



138.

Façade of the Hôtel Soubise. From Mariette.

impressing the stranger in Paris with the same sense of magnificence as he receives from those of Italy and other countries. In Florence, Rome, or Venice, the street front is almost invariably the largest, and the most richly decorated of the whole building; but in almost every case in Paris, there is only, towards the street, a high dead wall, divided into compartments by rusticated piers, with a panel between each, and in the centre a *porte-cochère* of more or less magnificence. It is only by entering or looking through this opening that we become aware that a palace is situated within; and even then, in nine cases out of ten, it is not the entrance front that is either the most beautiful or the most richly adorned, but the one facing the garden, which is an almost indispensable adjunct to a Parisian hotel.


As a general rule, the Parisian architects of this age use the Orders very sparingly in these hotels—with good taste employing them only in the centres, where a porch or projection of some sort is almost indispensable; and if they go further, the additional pillars or



pilasters seem to be suggested by those which were introduced by necessity.

Among the most elegant of the palaces of this class are the *Hôtels* of *Soubise* and *De Rohan*, both built by *Lemaire*, and very similar, except that the former is two, the latter three, storeys in height. Both are characterised by the usual faults and beauties of the style—a sober and elegant employment of the Orders, less frequently as mere ornaments; and a forced regularity, making carriage-entrances and saloon windows exactly similar in design.

The *Hôtel de Noailles*, erected from the design of *Jean Marot*, is another pleasing example of a three-storeyed building of the age, and, though exhibiting no remarkable excellence of design, is sufficiently dignified and palatial for its purposes. Like the *Hôtel Soubise*, it may be taken as a type of a great many buildings of the same class which were erected in Paris about this time. Others, such as that of the *Duc du Maine*, are entirely without pillars, which is perhaps the more usual arrangement; but even here the cornices are all profiled, as if the Classical Orders had been intended somewhere, and it was thought necessary to adhere to their proportions. As before remarked, indeed, one of the great deficiencies of this style is that nowhere was a cornice introduced with a projection proportioned to the whole height of the building—a feature which gives such dignity to those of the earlier Italian period, and which, in Venice especially, is frequently introduced, even where the whole building is covered with pillars or pilasters proportioned to each individual storey only.



139.

*Hôtel de Noailles. From Mariette.*

Another defect, which is very apparent to those who are familiar with Italian or English buildings, is the immense size and frequency of the openings, leaving very little plain wall anywhere; and as the carpentry of the windows is generally clumsy, and the glass bad, this

Another defect, which is very apparent to those who are familiar with Italian or English buildings, is the immense size and frequency of the openings, leaving very little plain wall anywhere; and as the carpentry of the windows is generally clumsy, and the glass bad, this

conveys a certain air of meanness, besides detracting from that repose and solidity which is so essential where anything like dignity is to be attained in Architectural Art.

This was carried to an extent not found anywhere else, in such buildings as the Trianon at Versailles and the Palais Bourbon in Paris. Both are one-storeyed buildings in all their principal parts, and, with their large openings, are only suited to the peculiar climate and still more peculiar practice of living in public which exist only in France, or where French manners and customs have been copied.

The great Trianon was built by Louis XIV. for Madame de Maintenon, from designs by Mansard. The centre is one grand gallery open on both sides, and, excepting that it has an opaque roof, looks more suited for a conservatory for plants than a royal residence. The wings on either hand, of exactly similar design, contain the living and sleeping apartments of the palace. Though rich in marbles and in decorations of every sort, the sameness throughout produces an unmeaning monotony that nothing can relieve.

The Palais Bourbon, executed from the designs of Girardini, in 1722, is better. There is some variety in the parts, but on the other hand there is a littleness in the details which betrays the commencement of the transition which was to connect the grandeur of the style of Louis XIV. with the prettiness of the present day. The dimensions, too, of the Palais Bourbon are small, and, as a town residence, surrounded by other buildings, it may almost be termed insignificant, a term which, whatever their other faults may be, can hardly ever be applied to any building erected by the Grand Monarque or the nobles of his court.

It is to Jules Hardouin Mansard that we principally owe an invention which has had a wonderful influence on the architecture of cities since his time. Having at Versailles reduced the architecture of a palace to that of a street, he next tried to elevate the architecture of a street to that of a palace. The two most notable examples of this are the Place des Victoires and the Place Vendôme at Paris. In both these instances a number of smaller buildings and private houses are grouped together in one design, so as to look externally and at first sight as one great building. The peculiar arrangement of Parisian houses, which have only one entrance for several residences, and that by a large *porte-cochère*, is peculiarly favourable to this species of deception; but after all it is only a trick, and one which never has been successful. The Place Vendôme is one of the best examples of this mode of grouping to be found anywhere, but fortunately it did not find favour in the eyes of the French architects, and after the age of Louis XIV. has scarcely ever been again attempted in any town of France, but it was so suited to save trouble to an architect, and to the



peculiarly small character of our independent residences, that it was considered a great discovery in this country, and almost every town in England has suffered more or less from its adoption.

A more successful as well as more legitimate attempt of the same sort was made by Gabriel,<sup>1</sup> under the following reign, in the two blocks of buildings which form the Place Louis XV., facing the Place de la Concorde. In making this design, it is evident that Gabriel was attempting to rival the famous colonnade which Perrault added to the Louvre; and, in fact, he has remedied several of its defects. His basement is much better designed, for here the main wall is seen coming down to the ground, while in the Louvre it is impossible to know what becomes of it. The coupling of the pillars is avoided, and, the whole being divided into two distinct masses, the proportion of height to width is better. On the other hand, there are two storeys of windows under the colonnade, and the suspicion of a third above it. The pillars are too tall, the profiles deficient in boldness, and the scale is so much smaller, that in these respects it will not stand comparison with the Louvre. The height of the Louvre façade is 95 feet, that of the Place Louis XV. only 72; and the latter, being situated at the end



140. Louis Quatorze Decoration.


of one of the largest Places in Europe, should have been designed on a much larger scale in order to have looked of the same size as one placed in so confined a space as the Louvre. They are not therefore fair rivals, though the work of Gabriel may fairly be classed as one of the most successful specimens of "terrace" architecture which has yet been executed, but has no real claim to belong to a higher class.

The true originality of the Architecture of the age is to be found not so much in the exterior as in the interior of the palaces which were then built. Although, in consequence of the exterior of their houses being so little seen, the nobles of France hardly cared to spend either much money or pains on their designs, it was very different with the interiors; and they vied with one another in the magnificence of their suites of public rooms and the splendour with which they were decorated. In some of the largest halls and vestibules, or in such galleries as those at Versailles, the Orders were introduced—generally Corinthian—with marble shafts and bronze capitals; but

<sup>1</sup> Born 1710; died 1782.

far more generally, and always in the smaller rooms, the decorations are in the style known as "Louis Quatorze," or Rococo.

Now that this fashion has passed away, it is impossible not to condemn the style and to regret its introduction. It is unconstructive and neither seems to grow out of any constructive necessity nor to suggest one. The lines and curves are confused, proceeding on no system, and are such as can be produced by an intelligent plasterer as well as by a first-rate artist. No genius could ennoble and no taste



141.

Louis Quatorze style of Decoration. From Versailles.

refine it. Still it has the great and unique merit of being *a style*, and the only thing approaching to one that has been invented since the Renaissance.

It is impossible to enter one of the saloons of this age without feeling that both thought and ingenuity have been applied to it for a definite purpose; and that unity and harmony have resulted, accompanied generally by brilliancy and splendour, almost sufficient to claim forgiveness for the bad taste too often displayed.



In modern drawing-rooms we often find, for instance, that the plasterwork and chimney-piers may be pure Grecian ; the paper covered with fleurs-de-lys of the most Mediaeval pattern ; the pier-glasses and console tables, Louis Quatorze ; the carpet, nature gone mad ; and the furniture with as much unity of design as may be apparent in a pawnbroker's shop. Anything is better than this ; and it is a great merit in the architects of the age of Louis Quatorze that they did not think their task finished when the last slate was put on the roof, but really applied themselves to what, after all, must be the most important part of a dwelling-house, and designed the arrangement and decoration of the living-rooms with more care than they applied to the exterior. In these interiors we find the ceiling and cornice of the same pattern as the walls ; they are carefully divided into panels, and each partition has a pier-glass, or a picture painted for the place, or an opening which fits it ; and the chimney-pieces and all the furniture are parts of the same design. When this is the case it would be difficult indeed to go wrong ; and even when we cannot help admitting that they did go wrong, it is still a relief, in the weary waste of modern copyism, to find one instance in which the talents of the architects have been exerted so much in this direction, and to feel that, if exerted in the right manner, they certainly would have produced something of elegance and beauty. Had the influence of the age been higher and less frivolous, or had their energies been directed to a nobler purpose than the decoration of the *salon* of a French lady of fashion of the age of Louis Quatorze, the merit of having invented a new style might have been awarded to them, as well as that of being the regenerators of Architectural Art in Europe.

## CHAPTER V.

## STYLE OF THE EMPIRE.

Napoleon, First Consul .. .. .	1800	Louis Philippe .. .. .	1830
Louis XVIII. .. .. .	1815	Napoleon III. .. .. .	1848
Charles X. .. .. .	1824		

THE latter half of the eighteenth century was not favourable for the production of works of a palatial class. A few public buildings were carried on, such as the Pantheon, the completion of St. Sulpice, and the building of the Place Louis XV., but national prosperity had received a shock, and the gathering of the tempest which burst with such violence in the last decade of the century had disinclined the public from such permanent investments as building always must be.

When, with returning prosperity, under the Empire, public works on a large scale again became a necessity, it is curious to observe how completely the style had changed. The pure Classic, of which David was the apostle in Painting and Canova in Sculpture, had also taken possession of Architecture. From the chief of the state to the chiffonier in the street, every one tried to believe, or to encourage the belief, that the Empire of France was the legitimate successor, or a reproduction, of that of Rome; and all things which were neither real nor essential were made to conform to the delusion.

One of the most important undertakings of this class in Paris was the remodelling of the Palais Bourbon, to adapt it for the purposes of the Corps Législatif. The property had been confiscated during the Revolution, and used for the sittings of the Council of Five Hundred, but was now to be adapted for a smaller and less turbulent assembly. The execution of this project was confided to Poyet, who, in 1807, commenced the façade opposite the Place de la Concorde. As it is one of the most correct reproductions which have been executed in modern times of the forms and arrangements of a very beautiful style of Architecture, it can hardly fail to be pleasing; and is, in fact, one of the most important monuments of the capital. Its great defect is one that it has in common with all reproductions of its class—that it is inappropriate, and does not tell its own story. Were it the façade of a Museum of Ancient Sculpture, it might be considered as doing so; but for any other purpose it only appears as a screen to hide something modern and useful, and of which, consequently, its designers



were ashamed. The five small doors under the portico can hardly be designed to open into a hall the whole height of the screen, and the two windows—one on each side—evidently only belong to the basement storey. How, then, is the rest lighted?—and to what purpose is it applied? Were it the back of an imperial racquet-court, it would be perfect; but if intended as anything else, it is a sham.

As the old pavilion of the Palais Bourbon still stands beside this, it is curious to observe the change that had taken place in design between the two ages to which they belong. As remarked above, the buildings of the age of Louis XIV. generally fail from being too light—being, in fact, all window. Those of the early part of this century,



142.

View of the Bourse, Paris. From a Photograph.

or of the Empire, pride themselves on having no windows at all; and the chief merit of this design and of the Pantheon is to puzzle the spectator as to how daylight is to be admitted. He was considered the greatest architect who contrived to conceal best what really was the most essential part of his design.

The Bourse, which was the next great building in this style, is not entitled to even this modicum of praise; for there nothing is concealed except the central hall, which, however, is the one thing which ought to be shown. The principal feature in this building is a great rectangular hall, 60 ft. by 110, with a corridor in two storeys all round it, and lighted from the roof; and which might easily have been made a principal and appropriate feature in the design, as is the case in

the Exchange in St. Petersburg, which is in consequence a far more truthful and satisfactory building than this. As it is, the building is merely a rectangular palace. It is 234 ft. in length by 161 in width, measured over the bases of the columns, and these are each 40 ft. in height. Two of the storeys of windows are shown beneath the colonnade, the third partly concealed by its balustrade at the top; but the existence of the attic prevents the roof having any connexion with the peristyle, and, as the proportions of the building approach much more nearly to a square than they ought, the roof is far too heavy and important for the rest of the edifice. Notwithstanding all this, a peristyle of sixty-six well proportioned Corinthian columns (twenty on each flank and fourteen on each front, counting the angle pillars both ways) cannot fail to produce a certain effect; but far more might have been produced by a less expenditure of means; and a different treatment was necessary in a situation like that of the Bourse, which stands in a small square, surrounded by tall houses, where, consequently, height and mass were indispensable. As before remarked, this last defect is nearly as apparent in the Madeleine—the other great peristylar building of the age. That church, however, is in reality only one great hall, requiring, as may be supposed, no windows at the side; and, in addition to this, the proportions of length to breadth in the Madeleine are much more pleasing, and the roof is not only a part, but, with its pediment, a most important and beautiful part, of the whole design.

If, therefore, it is determined that we must copy buildings of this class, the Madeleine may be considered a success, but the Bourse a failure, not only in consequence of the ill-adjusted proportions of its parts, but also because of the utter want of meaning of a peristylar arrangement as applied to such an erection.

This purely Classical, or, as it is sometimes called, Academic style, took no permanent root in France; and in all the recent buildings, though more numerous and more expensive than those erected in France in a like time at any period of her history, no attempt has been made to reproduce it. It never did extend to Domestic or Street Architecture. On the contrary, nothing is so creditable to the French architects as the truthfulness and elegance with which they have elevated domestic structures into the domain of Fine Art. It is true the circumstances were extremely favourable to the attempt. The mode of living in apartments one over the other, instead of in houses side by side, as in this country, enabled them to obtain masses of building palatial in scale, and this, with their requiring only one entrance, generally in the centre, were all circumstances very much in their favour. Add to this the facility with which the Paris building-stones can be carved and worked into ornaments of every class, together with the number of skilled workmen capable of executing



any design at a moderate cost, and it will be easily understood what facilities they possessed over the architects of other countries. They have availed themselves, however, of all this to an extent, and with an ability, that the architects of other countries have seldom shown themselves capable of; and the consequence is that the Street Architecture of Paris is unsurpassed by anything in Europe. There are, of course, great inequalities of design, as there must be where so much variety exists. In some instances the old disease of pilasters breaks out with an unmeaningness worthy of the age of *Henri Quatre*; but as a general rule the dressings of the windows, their balconies, and the string courses which mark the floors, are left to tell the story; and when this is the case it is really impossible to go wrong. All that is then required is the application of a certain amount of ornament, necessary to elevate the building into an object of Fine Art. When this is done, all that remains open to criticism is the quality of that ornament, and the appropriateness with which it is applied to the various parts of the design.

It may be scarcely within the scope of the present work to allude to contemporary buildings, or to criticise the works of living architects; but it is impossible to conclude this chapter without mentioning some of the great works which have been erected in France under the Second Empire.

One of the greatest and most successful of these is the completion of the great group of palaces formed by the junction of the Louvre with the Tuileries. The first attempt at this was made by *Henry IV.*, who commenced the great gallery in his own clumsy style of Architecture, and in such a manner as to make the want of parallelism between the two palaces offensively apparent. Since his day, the grand crux of French architects has been to get rid of the awkwardness then created; and there is not one of any eminence during the last two centuries who has not produced a design for effecting this object.

Nothing, however, has been done except erecting a portion of the north wing in a style corresponding to that of the south, which was commenced during the reign of the First Napoleon, and it was left for the late *M. Visconti*, under directions from *Napoleon III.*, to set the problem practically at rest. This he has done most successfully, in the manner exhibited in the plan (*Woodcut No. 113, ante, p. 243*), where all the different stages by which this great group of edifices has been brought to its present state are marked out by the different tints employed, with the dates affixed to each. So ingeniously have the new portions been arranged, that the want of parallelism, pointed out above, is hardly felt. The only prominent defect remaining is the great extent of the *Place du Carrousel*, and the lowness of the buildings which surround it; the *Place* itself being 850 ft. by 930, while the

palace or the galleries are not generally more than 60 or 70 ft. high. Nothing could now remedy this except the erection of some large building in its centre. If, for instance, a tall triapsal domical church (as dotted in, in the plan, Woodcut No. 113) were placed with a porch where the Triumphal Arch now stands, it would not only reduce the whole to harmony, but would give to the group that one feature which is required to give it dignity. At present the buildings hardly rise above the dignity of the streets in their vicinity, and the whole wants some grand central feature to give unity to the group, and to dis-



143. View of the Angle of the Place Louis Napoléon, new buildings of Louvre From a Photograph.

tinguish it from the domestic edifices which approach so close to it on the North. Another mode in which this indispensable feature might have been supplied to some extent, would have been by elevating the north-eastern angle, where the new buildings abut on the Rue Rivoli (at A in the plan), so as to make it a feature, which ought to have been as important as Barry's angle tower to the Parliament Houses. The situation in Paris is far finer, commanding as it does the whole of that long line of streets both ways. By a strange oversight, this angle is now the least dignified portion of the whole design.



Notwithstanding these defects of conception, the architect deserves all praise for adopting a style which allowed him such freedom, while it harmonized so perfectly with what had been done before. The new portions are well proportioned to the areas in which they stand, the Place Louis Napoléon being about 600 ft. by 400, while the average height of the buildings may fairly be taken as 100 ft. The whole design is also so free from the ordinary defects of concealment and shams, that it must be considered as about the best specimen of Palatial Architecture of modern times. It is quite true that the details might have been purer without losing any of their effect, that a deeper cornice would have accorded better with the shadow obtained from the arcade below, while the tall wooden roofs that crown the pavilions are scarcely a legitimate mode of gaining height, and liable to become exaggerated and grotesque. But these may all be excused by the necessity of adopting a style in conformity with the parts that existed before, and to which all these features legitimately belong. Even admitting this, however, if we compare the buildings surrounding the Place Louis Napoléon with anything that has been done recently in Italy or Germany, we can have no hesitation in awarding the palm to the French design. If we compare them with any of our own contemporary productions, such as the Houses of Parliament or the British Museum, we see how happily it takes a medium course between the frigid Classicity of the one and the florid Mediaevalism of the other; while it is in every respect suited to the wants of the age, and expressive of its feelings, to which neither of the other examples can make any pretension.

The changes that have been made in the building of the Tuileries since Visconti's death are by no means equal in merit to those carried out under his superintendence. One of the most prominent of these is the rebuilding of the Pavillon Flore at the end of the Pont Royal. Its design is certainly a great improvement on that of the Henry IV. building it replaced; but it wants the vigour and appropriateness which characterises the design of the Place Louis Napoléon. The greatest blunder, however, which has been committed consists in neglecting to seize the opportunity afforded by the rebuilding of dignifying the river façade with a centre-piece worthy of its situation.

In the centre, opposite the Pont du Carrousel, is the principal entrance to the palace, consisting of three great archways and two side arches, all so bold and bridge-like as not only to suggest but to challenge some corresponding features over them. So far, however, from this being the case, this part of the façade is the lowest and meanest part of the whole design. Had it been carried up to at least twice its present height, it would have gone far to redeem this front from the monotony and want of dignity which at present characterise it. A façade 900 ft. in length, and of nearly uniform height throughout,

and with no breaks, must look low and tame, especially when situated on a broad quay and with a wide river in front of it. But with a pavilion as dignified as that of Flore at either end, and a centre of greater height and dignity than either, the whole would have been reduced to harmony, and it would have certainly been—what it is now nearly—the finest palace front in Europe.

These and other faults in recent erections make us dread what may be designed to replace the old picturesque garden-façade of the Palace when it comes to be rebuilt. The north and south fronts will be restored, as nearly as may be, as they were before the fire, with, perhaps, some modifications in the Pavillon Henri IV. to assimilate it with that of Flore, as recently rebuilt; but the stonework of the central part has been so damaged that it seems inevitable the whole should be removed, and when this is done the question comes, what is to replace it? To restore the whole façade as it was would be pedantic and absurd, and such an extent of building can hardly now be expected to be wanted for a royal residence. But accommodation might be obtained for some of the great departments of the State, with a suite of reception-rooms and an official residence for the President or head of the State. With the variety such a destination would afford and the dignity of such a purpose, it may be erected in a form worthy of what is really the finest site in Europe; but, looking at what has recently been done there and in Paris generally, one cannot but tremble for the result.<sup>1</sup>

One of the most successful efforts of the same class as the completion of the Tuileries was the amplification of the Hôtel de Ville, by Le Sueur. Here the difficulty was nearly as great, inasmuch as it was necessary to amalgamate the whole façade of Francis I., in the centre of the principal front, with the new buildings which were to enclose and surround it on all other sides. The problem was, to give the new buildings sufficient importance, without dwarfing to any extent the old.

This was most successfully accomplished, but it is perhaps owing to this that the building as a whole wanted that commanding height which its situation required, and which prevented its having that dignity, when seen at a little distance, which it possessed when seen from a nearer point of view. Like the new buildings of the Louvre, it was free from any sham or concealment, and its internal arrangements—especially the Great Gallery—were as fine as anything of

<sup>1</sup> If the Archbishop had the power, the centre of this façade would form a far finer position for his new Cathedral, than the heights of Montmartre, where he intends to place it. The difficulty of making the change, however, probably

consists in the fact that the unwashed Communists of Belleville must submit, though the well-dressed infidels of the aristocratic quarter might resist the obtrusion among them of such a symbol of the Church's pre-eminence.




their class in Europe. The Gallery of the Hôtel de Ville, though not so large or so rich, was far more artistic than anything of the sort that is to be found at Versailles.

The Library of Ste. Geneviève is another of the new edifices of Paris well deserving of study, being wholly astylar, and, without pretending to be anything beyond a modern depository of books, it gives a promise of common sense being once more thought compatible with Architectural Art. When it is once discovered that a building can be made sufficiently ornamental without assuming a foreign disguise, the art will again be in the path of progress; and this truth seems dawning on the French architects, though whether to brighten into sunshine or not remains to be seen.

This Library is a parallelogram of 263 ft. by 75, with a projection for the staircase behind, and the height from the ground-line to the top of the cornice is 60 ft. The one defect of the design is its flatness. Had there been a projection in the centre, or at either end of the façade, it would have remedied this defect and supplied the shadow, to obtain

which so many architects have been driven to employ porticoes and other incongruous details to their buildings.

The impulse given to building operations by the system adopted by the late Emperor of giving employment to the people, has led to the erection of an immense number of civil and municipal edifices in the provinces, as well as in Paris. Some of them are not perhaps in the best taste; many betray marks of extreme haste in preparing the designs, and a few of a lingering towards the Classical feeling of



144. Angle of the Library of Ste. Geneviève, Paris.

an earlier epoch. One of the most remarkable of the last class is the new Exchange just completed at Marseilles, which, notwithstanding the elegance of its details, is one of the least satisfactory buildings of the Empire. That recently completed at Lyons errs in the opposite direction, some of its details verging on the Rococo; but, taking it altogether, it may be considered as one of the most typical examples to be found anywhere of what the French architects are aiming at and most admire. It is not very pure or very elevated, it must be



145.

New Bourse, Lyons. From a Photograph.

confessed; but it may fairly be asked—is a purer or more elevated style compatible with the purposes of a Chamber of Commerce and an Exchange? A church, a palace, or a tomb requires it; but is not this style as dignified as the purposes to which it is applied? and truth in Art demands no more than this.

The new Custom-house at Rouen is another favourable specimen of the mode in which the French architects of the present day design the minor class of public edifices. Neither the dimensions nor the purposes of such a building admitted of very great grandeur or



richness being obtained. It is, however, sufficiently magnificent for the custom-house of a provincial city, and it expresses its purpose with clearness, while no useful element is sacrificed for the sake of effect, and no ornament added which in any way interferes with utilitarian purposes.

The ordinary receipt for such a design, especially in this country, would have been a portico of four or six pillars, darkening some and obstructing the light of other windows, besides necessitating the building being—in appearance at least—only two storeys in height. It is an immense gain when architects can be induced to apply the amount of thought that is found here; and with a little more care in



146.


Custom-house, Rotterdam.

the details, and a little more variety in the arrangement of the parts, this might have become a more beautiful design than it is, though few of its class can, on the whole, be called more satisfactory.

In several other of the new buildings of Paris and in the provinces there is shown a great tendency to get rid of the Orders, and, as in these instances, to depend upon the structural arrangement for expression. The worst feature of the case is, that the architects do not seem to have hit on any definite system of ornamentation, and consequently, in attempting to be original, they sometimes fall into mistakes as offensive as the stereotyped absurdities of their predecessors. They are, however, in the right path, and, we may hope, will be ultimately successful in producing a style suited to the wants of the age.

## DOMESTIC ARCHITECTURE.

It is perhaps, however, in their Domestic Architecture that the French architects have achieved the greatest success, and with the largest amount of originality. The modern Parisian houses cannot, of course, vie with the *hôtels* of the older nobility in dignity or grandeur; but it is just because they do not attempt this that they succeed. They pretend to nothing but being the residences of a rich and luxurious community, and every house on its face bears marks



147. House, Rue Soufflot. Le Sueur, architect.


of what it is, and of the rank or position of its occupiers. Even when they use the Orders with the most lavish hand, they do it with originality; and if it is objected that pillars are not wanted, they are not out of place, and do not pretend to make the building or its storeys look other than it really is. The example (Woodcut No. 147) from the neighbourhood of St. Geneviève is only an average specimen; but out of Venice it would be difficult to find anything so rich and, at the same time, so devoid of affectation. Like most of the Parisian designs, a great part of its effect is due to

the grouping of the windows. As is frequently the case in Venice, the centre has three or five windows placed tolerably close to one another, then a pier and a single window, with a similar pier beyond. In the façade of a dwelling-house this is perhaps the happiest arrangement that has been hit upon, as it not only gives constructive solidity to the design, but suggests an internal arrangement of considerable dignity of effect.

If it be objected that the "Orders" are overdone in this example, it is easy to select another (Woodcut No. 148) in which they are only,



as it were, suggested, but where the same principles of arrangement are carried out, and with as pleasing an effect. Or a third (Woodcut No. 149)<sup>1</sup> may be taken, where the Orders do not exist at all; and, though less rich in consequence, the design is scarcely less elegant. It by no means follows that, because the Orders are the only ready-made means of enriching a design at the present day, they are always to remain so. There are numberless other devices by which this may be effected, though, it is true, their employment requires not only taste but thought; and the great merit of Parisian Architecture is, that these qualities are found there more frequently than in any other city of modern Europe. The great charm, however, is that in Paris there are not three or four such designs as those quoted above, but three or four hundred—many, it must be confessed, of very questionable taste, and where the ornaments are neither elegant in themselves nor properly applied; but these are certainly the exceptions, and even they tend to produce a variety and richness of effect in the new Boulevards and streets, which renders Paris the richest and most picturesque looking city of modern Europe. It is the only town, in fact, that affords an answer to the reproach of the Mediævalists, who, when they single out the dull monotony of Regent's Park Terraces or Edinburgh Rows, need only turn to the new quarters recently erected in Paris to see that the dullness of which they complain is not in the style but in the architects, and that it must be as easy for us, if we had the wit to do so,



148.


Rue des Saussaies. Architect, Le Jeune.

<sup>1</sup> These three Woodcuts are taken from Calliat's *Parallèle des Maisons de Paris*.

to make our towns as picturesque, and far more beautiful than they were when filled with the rude and inconvenient dwellings of our forefathers.

The best period of this peculiar style of Domestic Architecture was

the latter part of the reign of Louis Philippe, or the first two or three years of the Second Empire. Since that time, taste in these matters has declined with wonderful rapidity in Paris. It may be that the demand for designs has been so great that the architects have not the time requisite for thought; or it may be that the excitement of sudden prosperity, and, consequently, an all-pervading *parvenuism*, has lowered the standard of taste generally. From whatever cause it may arise, the fact is certain that the profiles of many of the new buildings are bad and weak, that the details are confused and ill drawn, and that pilasters are frequently employed to cover a certain surface with ornamentation without the necessity of thought. All this is very sad; for if a people so essentially artistic as the French are, and always have



149. House, Rue Navarin. A. Lhuier, architect.

been, go astray, the prospect of architectural improvement in modern Europe is poor indeed.

### TROPHIES AND TOMBS.

Whatever opinion we may be inclined to form regarding the Ecclesiastical or Domestic Architecture of the French, it is certain that they have exceeded all other nations of Europe in that pre-eminently Celtic form of Art which expresses itself in the erection of Trophies to commemorate the glories of the nation and of Monuments to record the memories of their dead.

It is of course in vain to expect, during a Renaissance period, when




everything must be based on precedent, that the French architects should do anything very original in this line. All their Trophies must be either Columns or Arches, not because these were either the best forms originally, or because they are the most appropriate now, but because they were the only ones used by the Romans. It is in vain to suggest that a Hall or a Tower might be made quite as monumental and far more convenient for the purpose; but there is no authority for this—and there the argument stops.

It must, however, be admitted that the French architects have occasionally made great efforts to rid themselves from this thralldom, and, except during the First Empire, with very tolerable success.

The Colonne de la Grande Armée at Boulogne is merely a Brobdingnagian Doric Column gone astray, and settled on a plain with which it has no apparent connexion. Its counterpart in the Place Vendôme at Paris is better, and tells its tale most unmistakably, but, in doing so, falls into an error which borders on the ludicrous. Its aim is to be an exact copy of Trajan's Column at Rome, and, with great good sense, the architect has avoided the absurdity of putting the

French army into the costume of that of Trajan. He has replaced the monumental helmets, shields, and breastplates of the Roman soldiers with the coats, cocked hats, and boots and shoes of modern costume; and the picturesque implements of ancient warfare with the drums, muskets, and cannon of the present day. All this was wise and well, and only becomes absurd when placed on a Roman monn-



150. Colonne de Juillet, on the site of the Bastille.

ment, and in the exact position in which the counterparts are found at Rome, so as everywhere to challenge comparison and provoke a smile.

If, when it was determined that modern costume should be represented, the architect had had the courage to adopt a polygonal base, a circular capital, and to suppress one or two of the more prominent Classical details, he might easily have retained the cylinder round which the French army climb to invisibility. He might, at the same time, have retained a sufficient amount of Classical detail to have suggested Rome, without bringing into such painful contrast the artistic treatment even of costume in ancient times as compared with the devices of the modern tailor.

Almost all these faults have been avoided in the Colonne de Juillet, which stands on the site of the Bastille. Of modern columnar monuments this is certainly the most successful. It is elegant and Classical in its details, and reasonably appropriate to its purpose. Its defects are, that, being only 165 ft. in height, it is scarcely sufficiently large for the very extensive Place, the centre of which it occupies; and the abacus of the capital ought certainly to have been circular. The angular forms of the Corinthian capital inevitably suggest an entablature; and of all things such a suggestion is the last wanted here. Notwithstanding these minor defects, it is certainly a great step in the right direction, and, if persevered in, we may yet see a monumental column worthy of its purpose.

On the whole, the French have been more fortunate with their Triumphal Arches than with their Columns. Of course there are some—such as the Arch of the Tuileries, the Arch at Marseilles, and that built by them at Milan—which, like the Imperial Columns, are copies and caricatures of the Roman examples, rendered ridiculous and incongruous, either by modern personages being put into Classical costumes, or modern dresses being associated with ancient forms. As far back, however, as the age of Louis Quatorze they attempted to escape from this absurdity. The two great specimens of the age—the Porte St. Denis, erected in 1672, by Blondel, and the Porte St. Martin, in 1674, by Bullant—are quite free from the reproach of being copies of Classical examples. As they originally stood, they must have been dignified and imposing erections; but since that time they have been so surrounded by houses taller than themselves, that they look painfully insignificant.

The first-named is by far the best and most original design of the two. Its façade is nearly square—75 ft. each way—and the footways are kept so entirely subordinate, that the centre arch has all the dignity required, and there is no mistake as to its purpose. Architecturally, its worst defect is its want of depth, which gives it a weakness of appearance highly detrimental to its monumental character;



and the sculpture borders so nearly on the Rococo of the age as to detract considerably from its effect. Still, it is a very original and a very grand design, and worthy of being imitated, as it was in the Arc de l'Etoile.

So far from being considered a defect, it is a merit in M. Chalgrin, to whom the design for the Arc de l'Etoile was intrusted, that he knew how to profit by what had been done by his predecessor, and, by improving on his design, to produce the noblest example of a Triumphal Archway in modern Europe. The dimensions of this arch are unsurpassed by any monument of its class in ancient or modern times, being 150 ft. wide, 75 ft. deep, and 158 in height to the top of the acroteria. It is



151.

Porte St. Denis. From a Photograph.

pierced with only one great arch in the centre, 97 ft. high by half that width, and one transverse arch at right angles with the principal one. The very simplicity of its design, however, robs it of its apparent dimensions to an extent not easily conceived. As mentioned in a previous volume, its size is as nearly as may be the same as that of the front of Notre Dame at Paris, exclusive of the towers; it does not look half so large, and there is no doubt but that if pillars had been employed they would have added very considerably to its apparent dimensions, but to what extent they would have detracted from its monumental character is not so easily predicated. It is probable, however, by panelling and projections properly applied, without interfering with the structural arrangements, all the size the Romans

knew how to give to their small arches might have been attained without the tawdriness that over-ornamentation imparted to them. The colossal character of the principal groups of sculpture detracts also considerably from the size of the monument, and prevents the eye obtaining any scale by which to measure it. Another defect is that, while all the greater groups are Classical in their costume, or rather want of it, the smaller groups on the friezes are in modern dresses, and the effect of the mixture is most disagreeable. But, notwithstanding these defects, both for conception, and for purity and



182. Elevation of the Arc de l'Étoile. From 'Les Monuments Publics de la France.'

grandeur of design, it stands alone among the Triumphal Arches of modern Europe; and, being also most fortunate in its situation, it is one of the finest monuments and greatest ornaments of the city of Paris.<sup>1</sup>

There is another, though only a quasi-triumphal arch, erected in front of the Ecole Polytechnique, which, though infinitely smaller in scale—being only about 40 ft. in height to the top of the acroterium—

<sup>1</sup> The cost of this monument, which is still incomplete, has been 417,812*l*.



is designed on the same principle, and so elegantly, that it well deserves notice. It could not, of course, be increased in size without a multiplication of its present details; but it is just one of those examples in which the French architects are so peculiarly successful in combining elegance with appropriateness, and, stepping out of the beaten path of the Orders, they seem occasionally on the point of inventing a new style, or perfecting that they have; but using the "Orders" saves so much trouble that they almost invariably lapse back to their more commonplace designs.

It is impossible to go into any of the cemeteries, even of the remote districts of France, without being struck with the superiority of taste



153. Entrance to the École Polytechnique. From 'Le Paris Moderne,' de Normand fils.

displayed in monumental sculpture and arrangement as compared with what is found in other less Celtic countries. In Italy there does not exist a respectable architectural monument from north to south.<sup>1</sup> What examples they do possess of this class are inside their churches, and more properly belong to the domain of sculpture than to that of Architecture, and, though some of them are very beautiful, it is not to this art that they owe their effect. In Germany, as might be expected, there is nothing worthy of the name, and as for our English attempts, the less said of them the better.

In the French cemeteries, on the contrary, the monuments are

<sup>1</sup> Those of Verona are an apparent exception, but it is by no means clear who the Scaligers were or whence they came.

always sepulchral, and generally appropriate to the circumstances of the persons whose memory they are designed to perpetuate. It is true that, till within the last few years, they have been frequently disfigured by an excess of Classicity and by an affectation of Pagan symbolism; but these were the defects of the feelings of the age, and not peculiar to this class of objects; while every day their designs are improving, and there is more appearance of progress in them than in almost any other class of subject. Their greatest defect, as purely architectural objects, is their want of size, few, indeed, being of such dimensions as to bring them out of the class of *objets d'art* into that of real structural Art, and some of the best opportunities have recently been thrown away in a manner much to be regretted. The little Chapelle Expiatoire, erected where the Duc d'Orleans was killed, is a substitution of a toy church for what should have been a dignified monument. Placing the remains of the Great Napoleon in the crypt of the Invalides was about as great a mistake as could be committed—architecturally—although everything that has been done there is in good taste, and many of the details worthy of all admiration.<sup>1</sup> It is still only a crypt, a small, and, from its position, an insignificant and undignified part of the building in which it is situated. It is an opportunity thrown away which only the French could have availed themselves of; and, for the sake of Monumental Art in Europe, it is to be hoped they will soon find some subject worthy of their peculiar talent in this department of Art.

### CONCLUSION.

After what has been said above, there is no great difficulty in instituting a comparison between the Renaissance styles of Italy and of France. To the former country belongs all the merit of the invention, everything there having preceded a corresponding development in France by at least half a century. To the Italians belongs exclusively the merit of inventing that class of domical churches of which St. Peter's at Rome is the typical example. At the present day a jury of architects might decide that there is small merit in the invention, but they ought to recollect that it has stood the test of more than three centuries. For all that time all the countries of Europe agreed that it was the most beautiful and the most appropriate form for their purposes, and we must not feel too sure that our present Gothic mania, which has hardly stood the test of thirty years, is not a mere passing fashion, and that another thirty years may not cause it to be regarded in the same ridiculous light as many other fashionable things

<sup>1</sup> This tomb is said to have cost already 360,000*l.*, a sum sufficient to have erected a noble mausoleum.



which have been as enthusiastically admired in their day. The probability is that something which is neither a domical Italian church nor a many-aisled Gothic cathedral is the thing suited to our wants; but, in the meanwhile, it is some credit to the Italians that they proposed a form which met with universal acceptance over the whole Christian world, and that for three hundred years nothing better was suggested anywhere.

The French did little or nothing to improve the form they borrowed from their southern neighbours, although using it with various local peculiarities, until at least the end of the last century. At this time the introduction of better understood Classical details made *Ste. Geneviève*—internally—a model which, if followed out consistently, might have led to an improved state of things; but externally it is inferior to many churches, not only in Italy but in France, and on the whole it cannot be said that the French have surpassed the Italians as church-builders, except in the more correct appreciation of Classical details in some of their more recent productions.

As regards Civil Architecture the French have invented nothing so original or so grand as the early palaces of Florence or Rome; and though they have recently adopted a style as rich and as ornate as that of Venice, it is only after long years of neglect that they have learnt to appreciate the beauties of that mode of treating domestic buildings.

Elegant and meritorious as the early French Renaissance is, it sprang unfortunately not from the grand feudal fortresses of the nobles, but from the extreme refinements which had been introduced by luxurious monks into their convents, or wealthy bankers into their civil dwellings. The Roman and the Florentine buildings, on the contrary, were the lineal descendants—the counterparts, in fact—of the feudal residences of the nobles in those turbulent cities when defence was as necessary in the streets as it was to the French baron on his seignorial estate.

When the French advanced beyond the earliest stage of the Renaissance they found themselves without any leading principles to guide them. They had not around them the mass of Classic details which steadied and guided the Italian architects of the sixteenth century; and the consequence was, that when they wished for something grander or more original than the style of Francis I., they attempted to graft the picturesqueness of the Gothic on the purity of the Classic styles, and produced the strange combinations of the age of Henry IV. From that time, with the increasing knowledge of Classic Art and greater experience in using it, the style of the French has gradually improved—with occasional backslidings—to the present day. The fate of Italian Art was different. So soon as they became satiated with the cold purity of that of the sixteenth century, they fell into the fantastic absurdities of the Borromini and Guarini school, and

since then have had neither greatness nor aspirations sufficiently definite to rescue them from the depths into which they then sank.

If we compare the Palais Royal with the Piazza of St. Mark (excluding of course the church), we shall obtain a fair means of judging of the two styles in the medium age and average degree of merit, and probably no one will hesitate to award the palm to the Italian example.

The library of the Piazzetta is, in like manner, a more palatial and more beautiful design than anything at Versailles or in any of the palaces of Louis XIV., while the Basilica of Vicenza will stand comparison with even the façade of the Louvre, and these are among the best and most typical examples of each of the styles. The great difference between the two seems to be, that Italian Architecture rose in glory to set early in frivolity and decay; the French style, on the contrary, rose in uncertainty, and was for a while obscured by caprice, but gradually was settling to what we should have said a few years ago promised to be the harbinger of a new style and a guiding star to the other nations of Europe. Recent performances have done much to shake this faith in their future, but it cannot be denied that, so far as Civil or Domestic Architecture is concerned, the French are, even at this moment, considerably in advance of the other nations of Europe.

In Ecclesiastical Art they are rapidly preparing to follow in our downward path, to forswear all thought or originality of design, and be content with mere reproductions of the past. This, however, can hardly last long with them, for they have more taste and more innate feeling for Architecture than any other nation of Europe at the present day. If they fail to emancipate the art from the trammels of copyism, the prospect is indeed dark, and we must be content to cherish more and more the relics of the past, for the future would then afford no hope that we shall ever again see a truthful object of Architectural Art on which the mind can dwell with the same satisfaction which it feels in contemplating the ruder works of even the most uncultivated nations.



## CHAPTER VI.

## RECENT ARCHITECTURE IN FRANCE.

[THE point at which our author concludes his observations on the Architecture of the French is practically the middle of the reign of the Emperor Napoleon III. ; and the somewhat unfavourable impression which he desires to leave upon the mind of the reader seems to accord with the view which at that time he would naturally take of the state of French society. We have to observe, however, at any rate, that the inauguration of the Second Empire, as matter of the history of Architecture, coincides with the commencement of that all-important movement which is identified with the era of the Great International Exhibitions, and the consequent advancement of the Industrial Arts at large at the expense of academical exclusiveness. No doubt there were certain branches of Art in which France, like England, instantly experienced the beneficial effects of the new departure ; but the artistic conditions of the two countries had no such correspondence as would cause them to go hand in hand in architecture ; and each took her own line. England was far behind France. England entered upon a new career ; and this has now led her to the cultivation for the moment of a style of *bric-à-brac* ; France, on the other hand, simply carried forward her established system to a further development of its own standard graces. In England we have now taken to Flemish Rococo ; France continues wholly French. The English cities have passed through a course of counterfeit Gothic ; the French cities have never thought of anything of the sort. We know not what we shall be next, when no longer Flemish ; France knows perfectly well that she will remain French. Whatever a shrewd analytical enthusiast like our author may say of the unreality or non-vitality of modern European architecture, there is this one exception, if only to prove the rule : the style of Paris in our day, whether the reader approves it or not, is the living perfection for the time being of the Modern European mode. So far as it may be deemed by some to be monotonous, enfeebled, mercurial, effeminate, meretricious, or whatever the opprobrious epithet may be, so far it is still the embodiment of the French mind in the modern world, in which France is still, as she has so long been, the undisputed leader in artistic practice. When she comes to be superseded—perhaps she is already rivalled—it may be by England or the English race ; but

the time is not yet, and especially in respect of the architecture of her towns.

The particular character which French Renaissance has assumed in recent times seems to be especially interesting. The Neo-Grec is not Greek, but French. If we apply the term "revival" in the customary way, it may perhaps be said that the Italians *revived* the Roman, and the Germans the Greek, as the English did the Gothic; but that the French, accepting both Roman and Greek, *created* the Neo-Grec. The Germans, no doubt, have since borrowed it from the French; but they cannot give it a spirit of their own; and the English cannot deal with it at all. In fact, it may probably be said with every confidence that the French are the only nation in Europe who in architecture do not revive and do not borrow; in their own style of language they might correctly say they only derive inspiration. There are comparatively few buildings in France of which it can be said that they are copied literally from the books, like so many of the best buildings in England and elsewhere. The French artist is always self-assertive; even when he is the direct representative of his academical mode, or is expressly imitating a foreign mannerism, he must always finesse with what he accepts or what he copies or adopts. This seems to be so characteristic of all that is done that we are accustomed to say anybody can identify French work anywhere; whatever may be its style by name, it is always French by nature; even if the substance be exotic, the surface is native. Hence it is that to the Art world of Paris there is no Art to speak of out of Paris. To the typical Parisian, indeed, the available universe itself scarcely extends more than a league or two beyond the walls; the reason is that Paris is for him so all-sufficient that the rest is surplusage. In the subject of Architecture this is most notably the case: the Neo-Grec is all-sufficient for use, and anything else is for amusement; the Neo-Grec is permanent, and anything else is transitory; the Neo-Grec improves from day to day, and anything else fails and is forgotten.

The essence of the Neo-Grec is finesse. The same finesse, so far as it could go in a primitive world, was the essence of the Hellenic antique. The French mouldings, modellings, decorative embellishments, and conventional motives at large, are all derived from—inspired by—the old Greek; for the simple reason that the Roman, and its outcome the Italian Renaissance, were deficient in finesse. How the old Roman degenerated from the Greek refinement, we well know; two thousand years have passed, and the modern Frank regenerates the same refinement, rehabilitating the crude new Roman with the old Greek delicacy, revivifying the corpus of the Italian with the animus of the Hellene.

The policy of the Second Empire in respect of architectural undertakings seems to have been directed by two motives, both equally legitimate when examined. It was desirable, those people tell us who



ought to know, to provide remunerative labour for the artisan classes—which in a great degree practically means much the same thing as to encourage building; and it was also good philosophy to promote the embellishment of the principal towns, as central points of popular culture and national patriotism. The Emperor and his advisers therefore determined to remodel Paris; and there are very few indeed who are not of opinion that they succeeded in effecting an excellent investment of the capital of the community in improving the Metropolis as they eventually did. The corresponding enterprises which they carried out in many of the provincial cities were equally well done.

The fall of the Empire, and the establishment of its political contrast, the Republic, did not substantially affect the course of architectural history in France as it might have done elsewhere. The administration of governmental affairs by bureaux has long been so extremely systematic that a revolution in the legislature, or in the streets, or even an occupation of Paris by a hostile army, seems to be a thing apart. The Republican *régime* has no doubt glittered less brightly in the sun than the Empire was wont to do; but there has been no material change in the tastes of the public, no introduction of any new ascendency—for the *beaux esprits* have always been in the ascendant, and are so still—no overthrow of anything more important than a handful of parasites, not even a little change of air in Parisian society. The architecture of the streets therefore has pursued the even tenor of its way, and one year has differed from another only as some leading designer may have added a trifle to the average of merit, or perhaps subtracted it.

The style of design, consequently, which belongs to French Architecture of the last five-and-thirty years makes no claim to be regarded otherwise than as the continued development of the European Renaissance at its headquarters. The main features are the same that have been continually employed since the sixteenth century, columnar or non-columnar Italian, modified according to the occasion or the fancy; and the only change in its handling has been an uninterrupted advance in the spirit of elegance which is peculiar to the genius of the French people. Many critics of the muscular order dislike this elegance from the beginning of its history; others prefer to think it has drifted into effeminacy only in recent times; there are still others who are of opinion that it has in itself sufficient vigour if it had not fallen into the hands of somewhat hasty and impulsive ornamentalists; but there it is, acknowledged on all hands, and, by the majority of refined people in all countries, encouraged and imitated.

Almost the only picturesque incident of any moment that has happened in the career of French Architecture during the period under review is the earnest and learned attempt of Viollet-le-Duc to awaken in the national mind a feeling of sentimental affection for the national

style of the Middle Ages. Compared with the results of the corresponding movement in England, the success of this revival has been so small as to be practically nothing. Two circumstances contributed to this failure. In the first place the French form of modern intelligence naturally leans away from "the Ages of Faith"; and the priests of an Ultramontane Church have no such hold upon the social affections of the moneyed classes as the very different order of clergy belonging to the English Church are able to maintain. In the second place there is a radical difference of motive between the French and English as regards the treatment of historical buildings. The English have always kept in view the preservation of the ancient aspect of the edifice; the French have always desired to remove the excoriation of antiquity and expose a renovated surface with which to start afresh. Viollet-le-Duc himself could not grasp the English idea of conservation, but even his much more modest enthusiasm came to nothing; most ably presented as it was to the artistic and patriotic world, it has not even created a school of enthusiasts, however small, to perpetuate his principles. The French are not addicted to the more sentimental forms of archæology at any time; the study of ecclesiological mysteries in particular would be foreign to their nature; the State, for purposes of State, is left to maintain the structures of the State; the architects in charge of them are the servants of the State; and there the matter ends.

In so far as any practical resuscitation of the Gothic style for use in new ecclesiastical work was included in the programme of Viollet-le-Duc, this project also has failed. Attempts have been made to build churches in an imitation of the Mediæval mode; but so entirely has the ancient spirit been almost always missed, that English Gothicists, in view of their own signal success, can scarcely be contradicted when they say that French architects are quite as unable to produce good Gothic as French people are to admire it.

A notable competition of designs took place shortly after the epoch of 1851 for a new cathedral at Lille, in which the English architects Burges and Street, then young men, took part, and were awarded the leading positions. In fact, it was this victory, surprising alike to the French and to ourselves, that first brought those two remarkable artists into public notice; the profound study of the higher ecclesiastical architecture which they had both pursued, and their evident devotion to the extreme Mediæval system, being manifested to a degree which was not only far in advance of the ecclesiology of the day, but at the same time most interesting even to the uninitiated. As usual nothing came of the competition but honour and loss; local patriotism—and why should we blame it?—was much too powerful to admit of an Englishman being employed to execute such a work.

Another celebrated competition of designs took place after the war of 1871 for the church of the Sacred Heart at Montmartre; but




Romanesque was the style that was favoured from first to last. The selected design cannot be called a great work, and its execution has not been fortunate.

Theatres have been more popular subjects in France than churches, and architecturally may be said to have been almost universally successful. The Paris Opera-house, by Garnier, was regarded as being in a manner the most characteristic building of the Second Empire, highly elaborated in the most voluptuous elegance of Rococo Neo-Grec; but the style of such work has advanced considerably since that time, and the Monte Carlo Theatre—which we may call French—is a much more meretricious example.

The Palais de Justice at Paris, by Duc, is scarcely equal to its metropolitan importance; but there are numerous local Mairies, Bourses, Law Courts, Hôtels-de-Ville, and other public buildings throughout the provinces, which maintain the national reputation for elegance and taste to the full; and the new Hôtel-de-Ville of Paris is a typical work of the highest class, which will be noticed presently. In all alike we see elegance increasing, in the proportions of features, the grouping of masses, the modelling of mouldings, the application of carving and sculpture, the general grace of composition and outline, and the painstaking study of detail. All this may perhaps be called more or less effeminate if one insists upon it; but if the beauty of French Architecture is as the beauty of woman, at least let us say that the man who cannot admire it is to be commiserated.—ED.]


[ILLUSTRATIONS OF RECENT ARCHITECTURE IN FRANCE.—The subjects that have been selected to illustrate the more recent progress of architectural design in France are necessarily very few; but it is hoped they may be regarded as sufficiently characteristic, and it would be quite superfluous to say that a whole volume could be filled with examples equally interesting.

The new Hôtel-de-Ville of Paris (No. 153a) is partly a reproduction of the edifice so unhappily destroyed in the madness of "the Commune," and otherwise a completion of the composition on perhaps less satisfactory lines; but the fine taste of the French is thoroughly exemplified, and the structure as a whole is of the most imposing character. At the same time we may contemplate this façade with mixed interest, as exhibiting the embarrassment in which the French genius may be said always to find itself placed when it has to deal with the imitation of that which derives its value chiefly from mere traditional authenticities. An English architect of the highest class—call him an archaeologist if you will—would have handled the new portions of the composition in at least a more archaeological manner. Possibly, indeed probably, he would have made the new work to look more ancient than the old; but the French designer certainly makes it appear a little too prominently more modern.



Hôtel-de-Ville, Paris.





Faculty of Medicine, Paris.



153c.

National Library, Paris.

The new building belonging to the Paris Faculty of Medicine (No. 153b) is a composition of a much more intelligible and characteristic type. Here we have the Neo-Grec at its best, elegance dominant in every part. Whether the reader thinks it could be improved is not the true critical question; there is nothing that cannot be censured. For example, there are not a few of us who may think they could




considerably improve the character of the entire basement, not only with very little trouble, but without diminishing the effect of simplicity, or severity, which the architect has had in his mind. There are several matters of detail, also, which might no doubt be unfavourably discussed. But be it observed that such blemishes are in reality amongst the characteristics of the age in which we live—an academical age straining after novelty, and taking the risk of failure where it is so easy to fail.

The exquisite example of interior work from the National Library in Paris (No. 153*e*) is worthy of more than a passing glance, because of the interesting combination of imposing richness and equally imposing simplicity which it presents to the critical judgment. That it is thoroughly French goes without saying; although some may remark that it might almost as well be German—not always bearing in mind, perhaps, how much of the best German work receives its inspiration palpably from France. One feels almost ashamed to ask whether there is effeminacy here; but there are not wanting critics of the more muscular order in England who will answer the question promptly in the affirmative. So be it; but one need feel no shame in suggesting, as another question, whether a little of that same effeminacy, or indeed a good deal of it, might not be attempted in some of our own public buildings with unquestionable advantage? Oh, for a gleam of it, for instance, in our dismal Litigation-Palace in the Strand!

The School of Art and Public Library at Marseilles (No. 153*d*) is a highly characteristic specimen of the more ordinary work which French architects are able to produce all over the country for comparatively unambitious purposes. It would be too sarcastic to invite a comparison between this building and some of the very respectable edifices with which English practitioners have ventured to adorn our provincial cities, whether in the Secular Gothic style, the Free-Italian, or the red "Queen Anne." But it is to be hoped at least that not even the most ardent admirer of muscular English work will fail to see that it must be a happy state of things artistic when architecture of this kind is actually common everywhere. That one might pick holes in its detail need not for a moment be denied; but the refined delicacy of it all, the simplicity, the grace, and indeed the unpretentiousness of it, and its inexpensiveness withal, and yet complete expressiveness—well may we say that the French are the modern Hellenes!

As one more example of current work, the Church of Ste. Hilaire near Rouen (No. 153*e*) seems to be well worthy of consideration. Churches in France are in many respects peculiarly circumstanced as compared with churches in England: and it may at once be said that church-building as practised in England could never be the *forte* of the French. Consequently there are not many specimens of ecclesiastical building, of what we regard here as the ordinary or every-day kind, which could be selected for fair comparison with our own. This Church



School of Art, Marseilles.





153a.


Church of Ste. Hilaire, Rouen.

of Ste. Hilaire is, however, one of them. It is needless to say that the design would not be likely to prove successful in an English competition. Nevertheless the reader will probably admit that it possesses very considerable merit.

If five hundred examples had been given instead of these five, the conclusion to be drawn would have been the same. Neo-Grec is the proper modern style of France, and it is capable of being treated quite sufficient variety. Its success always depends upon refinement, not courage, but finesse. It is never a slap-dash style, but it becomes fastidious and finikin. It may be meretricious and whimsical, but it is never *brusque*. It may be too ladylike for some of us, but is it not beautifully dressed?

Has the question ever been fully discussed how far ancient colonisation on the soil of primitive France may have produced by due heredity, *inter alia*, the Hellenic motive in modern French art? It seems to be quite clear that there was no Hellenic taste communicated to France from Italy at the time of the Renaissance. May it not also be equally recognised that during the previous period the Gothic of France, as compared with the same style elsewhere, had a refined grace of its own of the same type as the subsequent Neo-Grec?—Ed.]





Col-  
N<sup>o</sup> 151517  
N.C





Central Archaeological Library,

NEW DELHI.

Acc. No. 20/00

Call No. 724.09/Fer

Author—Fergusson, James

Title *History of the Modern  
Styles of Architecture*

Borrower No.

Date of Issue

Date of Return

*"A book that is shut is but a block"*

CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL LIBRARY  
GOVT. OF INDIA  
Department of Archaeology  
NEW DELHI.

Please help us to keep the book  
clean and moving.